LABOR AGE

Volumes 9-10
1920-1921

Greenwood Reprint Corporation
New York
1968

This reprint edition reproduces, in an unaltered form, the entire contents of the original publication, as far as it has been possible to determine.

This work has been printed on long-life paper and conforms to the standards developed under the sponsorship of the Council on Library Resources.

Printed in the United States of America

JUNE 1920

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

THE SOCIALIST CONVENTION

EUGENE V. DEBS

FEDERAL CONTROL OF RAILROADS

THE AMALGAMATED

SPANISH POLITICS

ROCKFORD TRIAL

Contents

TO OUR FRIENDS.....Page 1

FEDERAL CONTROL OF RAILROADS
Otto S. Beyer, Jr.....Page 2

REALITIES IN SPANISH POLITICS
Luis Araquistain .....Page 10

DANISH AND DUTCH STRIKES
Marian Tyler .....Page 13

SOCIALIST UNITY
Eugene V. Debs.....Page 15

THE AMALGAMATED ON TRIAL
Jessica Smith .....Page 16

DEBS IN 1920
David Karsner .....Page 19

SPRING IN 1920
Miriam Allen de Ford.....Page 23

THE NATIONAL CONVENTION
"We Want Debs." W. Harris Crook .....Page 24
The Socialist Convention. Harry W. Laidler.....Page 26
Declaration of Principles...Page 36
The Socialist Party Platform..Page 38
Minority Declaration of Principles .....Page 41
International Relations Report .....Page 41

THE ROCKFORD TRIAL
Edgar Owens .....Page 43

COLLEGE NOTES.....Page 46

BOOK REVIEWS:
Law and the Modern State. Leon Duguit .....Page 48
The American Labor Year Book. Edited by Alexander Trachtenberg .....Page 48

Our Contributors

Luis Araquistain. Member of the Socialist Executive Committee for Spain, ran on Socialist ticket in 1919 against La Cierva; editor of *Espana* and Spanish correspondent to the Foreign Press Service.

Captain Otto S. Beyer, Jr., M. E. For several years engineer on Erie & Rock Island railroads; research engineer, engineering experiment station University of Illinois; during the war chief of the arsenal orders branch, the Ordnance Department; lately head of research department Plumb Plan League.

W. Harris Crook, M. A. Managing Editor of *The Socialist Review,* former editor of the Boston *Forward.*

Miriam Allen de Ford. Contributor to liberal and radical magazines.

David Karsner. Sunday editor New York *Call;* author of "Debs: His Authorized Life and Letters" and "Horace Trubel: His Life and Work."

Harry W. Laidler, Ph. D. Editor of *The Socialist Review,* author of "Socialism in Thought and Action," etc.

Louis Levine, Ph. D. Author of "Syndicalism in France," etc.

Edgar Owens. Secretary of the Communist Labor Party in Illinois.

Jessica Smith. Graduate of Swarthmore College, Executive Secretary of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society.

Ordway Tead. Author of "Instincts in Industry, etc.

Marian Tyler. Graduate of Oberlin College, Business Manager of *The Socialist Review.*

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Vol. IX. JUNE 1920 No. 1

To Our Friends

THIS issue commences a new volume of *The Socialist Review*. For six months we have laid before our readers a veritable mental feast with each issue, for which our warmest thanks are due to our many literary contributors who have so generously given of their time and talent. As each month passed *The Socialist Review* has been received with an ever-growing chorus of warm approval and enthusiastic commendation. To all our friends, old and new, who have thus provided such welcome encouragement we offer our appreciative acknowledgment.

With this new volume we take the opportunity to lay before our friends the situation as it faces us on the material plane. With a steadily growing subscribers' roll and retail sale, we have, nevertheless, to meet each month a very rapid and serious increase in the costs of publication. Paper and printing alone are today nearly one hundred per cent. higher than when we first drafted our annual budget last fall. Yet we do not raise our price to our readers and heartily trust that we shall not be so compelled in these days of universal high prices. For the period of excessive paper prices we shall reduce the number of our pages from 64 to 48 in order to conserve paper.

Unlike certain of our contemporaries we cannot go to a select group of ultra-conservative moneyed patrons. Nor can we, as yet, command the advertising clientele of those radical journals with a circulation of over fifty thousand. We do not possess the facilities of the great rail and packing concerns with which to play upon the sympathies of the public for higher rates or governmental subsidies!

There is open to us, however, that most democratic route to self-dependence, the whole-hearted support of every single reader of *The Socialist Review*. We urge every reader to aid us in our Sustaining Fund, without which we cannot long continue. They can, moreover, give us one or more subscriptions on behalf of friends or acquaintances and thereby pass on to others the opportunity of keeping in close touch with labor and socialism the world over, month by month. Finally, every reader without exception can win for us at least *one* new reader in the next three summer months, and by doing so double our circulation.

This is a most critical year in American history and few things are more needed today than the quiet, authoritative, and interesting portrayal of the facts behind the workers' movements, such as is offered each month in the columns of *The Socialist Review*.

THE EDITORS.

Federal Control of Railroads

O. S. Beyer, Jr.

AMERICAN railroads were under Federal control from December 28, 1917, to February 29, 1920, a period of twenty-six months. This period was filled with difficulties which would have doubtless proved almost insurmountable to any type of private control. The achievements of the Railroad Administration, despite these unexampled difficulties, are most significant. It is deeply to be regretted that the real successes achieved by the United States Railroad Administration have been so little known and understood. This ignorance is due in no small measure to the campaign of misrepresentation, fact suppression and distortion so successfully carried on by the predatory interests. A careful study of the accomplishments of Federal control will show how misrepresentative has been this campaign.

The work and results of the Railroad Administration have been presented in periodic reports, in testimony before congressional committees, and in addresses by the Director General and directors of various divisions of the central administration. This array of indisputable evidence is very extensive and can only be outlined in a brief article like the present.

The railroads were taken over by the government largely as a war measure. They were in deplorable condition and their increasing failure to function seriously menaced American military activities. It is quite generally acknowledged that the unification of our railroads at the time of its inauguration was a desirable move and a step that helped materially in the successful prosecution of the war.

The important tests of Federal control come, however, when its results, whether under war or peace conditions, are examined in the light of the purposes for which the railroads were taken over, aside from helping to win the war, as laid down by Mr. McAdoo, the then Director General, in his "Declaration of Policy," June 17, 1918.

Eliminating Superfluous Expense

One of the chief purposes indicated in this declaration was the elimination of unnecessary expense, and from the very beginning this reform was vigorously pushed. The official staffs of the railroads were reorganized, as a result of the consolidation of territories, with the effect that the total number of officers receiving a salary of $5,000 per year or over was reduced from 2,325 to 1,925. This reduction alone netted a saving of $6,257,198 (the salaries paid being $15,062,998 as compared with $21,320,187). The Federal Administration required an annual salary outlay of $1,642,300, so that the final saving was $4,614,889, or 21.6%. The expenses of the law departments were reduced by approximately $1,500,000. The elimination of advertising expenses necessary under competitive private control effected another saving of $7,000,000. By the use of railroad telegraph lines in place of commercial lines, a saving of 51% in telegraph tolls became possible. The combining of time tables for different roads between identical points and the elimination of the expensive, garish through folders resulted in further simple savings.

"Off-line" ticket and freight offices, maintained by private railroad companies for the solicitation of freight and passenger traffic in centers not on their own roads, were ordered discontinued. The saving estimated from this source amounted to $12,142,446.

For competitive reasons, under private control, extensive and wasteful passenger service was maintained between many of the large cities of the country. Under Federal control, it was found practicable both as a war and an economy measure to reduce the number of such trains materially, while at the same time distributing those retained over such hours of departure as actually to improve the service. Passenger traffic, wherever possible, was directed through natural routes. Thus, during the first year an aggregate of 57,420,000 passenger train miles were eliminated, reduc-

ing costs by many millions. While this curtailment in passenger service was largely due originally to the necessity for troop movements, it was not followed by a decrease in the number of passengers, including troops, actually hauled, as is evidenced by the following table:

Number of Passengers Carried One Mile	
1916	34,585,952,026
1917	39,361,369,062
1918	42,498,248,256
1919	46,200,000,000

Consolidation and Pooling.

The consolidation of ticket offices, begun promptly in 1918, proceeded until 108 such offices were in successful operation in our large commercial centers. The savings in rentals alone from such combinations amounted to about $1,846,976.04 annually. Mr. McAdoo estimated that the total savings which would accrue from this reform would reach $4,424,187.

In many of the larger cities freight terminals and passenger terminals were consolidated. In the West alone, 226 stations were closed as a result of such consolidation. A notable example of intensified passenger terminal utilization is that of the Pennsylvania Terminal in New York City which was opened to the Baltimore and Ohio and the Lehigh Valley railroads.

Freight lines in and around large cities were unified and coordinated with far-reaching effects on economical, efficient, and prompt operation. Terminal managers were appointed in the larger centers to handle this work. In and around Chicago, the three belt lines were properly coordinated so that they functioned to their maximum capacity and with much greater expedition than had ever been possible in the handling of freight through this highly complicated territory. All the marine facilities in the harbor of New York were pooled under a marine manager and used in common, with very satisfactory results.

Similarly, road haul facilities were unified, the Director of Public Service emphasizing particularly the great benefits which followed the routing of Baltimore and Ohio freight trains between McKeesport and New Castle over the tracks of the Pittsburgh and Lake Erie. One engine handled the tonnage of five between these same points on the Baltimore and Ohio.

All passenger and freight equipment was promptly placed in a national pool. This led to more effective utilization of existing equipment and made possible the handling of the vastly larger traffic of 1918 and the latter part of 1919.

Terminal repair facilities were unified as rapidly as possible, so that, by the end of 1918, 417 such points were in operation. This coordination meant a net saving of $2,363,535.95. By the end of 1919, 844 terminals were thus consolidated. Locomotives under these conditions were repaired in the most convenient and economical places, and their time out of service "awaiting repairs" was often greatly reduced.

Intensive Use of Equipment

Numerous other devises were effected under unified national control to utilize more intensively than was previously possible the equipment of the road. One striking example was the plan for solid train movements of food, fruit, oil, and lumber from the West to the East. These trains were handled via the most direct and open routes. Most of the country's food products are hauled in refrigerator cars. During 1919 the total number so loaded and moved was 297,660, as compared with 246,664 during 1918, an increase for 1919 of 50,996 cars, or 20.77%. This greatly enlarged volume of business was conducted most successfully despite the fact that there had been no increase in refrigerator car equipment for several years.

Approved routings of freight, giving "due regard to the fact that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points," were established without delay by the Railroad Administration. Examples of the shortening of freight routes are, for instance, the following:

Between	*and*	*Saving in Miles*
Los Angeles	Dallas	500
Casper, Wyoming	Montana points	880
Southern California	Ogden, Utah	201
Kansas City	Galveston	289
Chicago	Little Rock	644
Minneapolis	Omaha	359

During 1919 in the Central Western Region a total of 77,669 cars were rerouted over the shortest routes possible, resulting in a saving of 12,065,849 car miles, or 155 miles per car. The shippers themselves, as a result of the efforts of the Administration, saved many thousands of car miles by turning cars into direct routes.

The Railroad Administration effected decided improvements in the efficient use of rolling stock by eliminating wastes due to the underloading of cars and locomotives. This is revealed by the following table, which compares the average trainloads and carloads for the calendar years of 1917, 1918, and 1919:

	1919	1918	1917
Average trainload, in tons, revenue and non-revenue freight	688	681	653
Average carload, in tons, revenue and non-revenue freight	27.8	29.2	27.0

As further measures along the line of maximum utilization of equipment, economy, and good service, the Railroad Administration inaugurated the so-called "Permit System" and "Sailing Day Plan." The "Permit System" required the shipper, prior to shipment, to submit evidence tending to show that ocean tonnage was available or that freight could be unloaded promptly on arrival at destination. The "Sailing Day Plan" provided the acceptance of less than carload shipments for export freight only in case these shipments could be concentrated in one car the cargo of which would be unloaded directly on reaching a port for ocean transport.

Other Economies and Reforms

One of the heaviest outlays required for railway operation is that made for fuel, the economical utilization of which largely depends upon the engine crew, the yard office staff, and the train despatchers. The extent to which these groups cooperate is instantly reflected in the fuel costs. The Fuel Conservation Section was keenly alive to all the possibilities presented for effecting economies in coal consumption. In consequence, during the year 1919 a total of $45,789,000 in fuel bills was saved, as compared with the previous year. In the last six months of 1918, there was a saving of $19,228,000 as compared with the same period in 1917.

The Mechanical Department of the Division of Operation took advantage of every opportunity which presented itself for reducing the expenses involved in maintaining equipment. Naturally, under the system of Federal control many such opportunities arose. For instance, through more careful inspection and maintenance of hand-brake equipment, and more careful supervision over switching yards and train operation, the total number of cars damaged for a certain period in 1919 as compared with 1918 was reduced from 580,815 to 515,719, a saving of $4,952,225 in simple car maintenance expenses per year. This reduction of damage to equipment furthermore reduced damage to the lading and permitted the cars to remain in service. Improvements like these are remarkably cumulative in effect.

Another important economy made by this department concerned the efficient handling of power at engine terminals. It was estimated that in January, 1919, an average of 30.58 man-hours was consumed in handling a locomotive at its terminal. In July this average was reduced to 25.77. Here alone was a saving of $4,263,541 per month, or of about $50,000,000 annually.

Many other economies were introduced by these departments, in the absence of the usual narrow commercial motives of private industry with their accompanying inhibitions. For example, existing equipment was modernized without delay by the application of well tried devices for improving efficiency, economy, and safety. Vocational training of employes was placed on a national basis, the Administration cooperating with the Federal Board for Vo-

cational Education in the establishment of training schools for apprentices. Again each skilled railroad man was considered by the Administration as a definite asset which was lost to the railway industry if, on account of temporary periods of dullness, the man left the service to enter private industry. Consequently arrangements were made through centralized employment bureaus to place men in other sections of the country where labor was in demand, in case work became slack in their usual localities. It can readily be seen what a humane, sensible step this was. It is also plain that under a system of private ownership and labor exploitation it would be "uneconomical" to pursue this policy in a whole-hearted way.

The advantage of standardization of new equipment was not overlooked. New cars and locomotives obtained by the Administration were carefully standardized to a few well thought out designs. This caused no little concern to the many railway speciality companies and advertising agencies which have been thriving on the old system. Statistical practice was standardized, thus enabling railway officers more easily to compare operating results on the various roads and regions.

The Labor Situation

In the handling of the labor situation the Railroad Administration exhibited a high degree of industrial statesmanship, recognizing, with remarkable clearness, the fundamental rights of the workers from the point of view of democracy.

It is not necessary to elaborate on the system of adjustment boards and commissions on wages and working conditions which were established and on which the workers maintained their representatives. Nor is it necessary to say much about the Division of Labor itself headed by one of the Chiefs of the Brotherhoods. An indication of the manner in which the basic rights of the worker were recognized is revealed by General Order No. 8, which provided that:

"No discrimination will be made in the employment, retention, or condition of employment of employes because of membership or non-membership in labor organizations."

The attitude of the Railroad Administration may also be seen from the following taken from the Director General's final report to the President:

"The rights of property seem to be susceptible of much more clear-cut definition and protection than the rights of labor, and yet the former, though highly important, certainly cannot exceed the importance of the latter."

And further:

"The policy of the Railroad Administration has been to secure the participation of the representatives of labor in matters affecting its interests and to endeavor to act with justice toward labor and with appreciation of the perfectly natural and proper point of view of labor."

The labor phase of Federal control of railroads is a long, interesting, and valuable development. Many significant truths so well recognized by readers of *The Socialist Review* were demonstrated as never before in the history of American industry. During this period a marked tendency toward peace and harmony in industrial relations was established, a condition disturbed only when a voice from Paris last spring announced "that of course the railroads would be returned to their owners at the end of the year," or words to that effect. But more important still a most significant movement was beginning to develop on the part of the employes in the interest of improved economy, efficiency, and service. The leaders of the railway workers actively endorsed this movement and personally urged the Railroad Administration to further it. They also agreed to do whatever was possible through the machinery of the labor organization to make our railroads the most efficient, the safest, the best in the world. Mr. Walker D. Hines understood and appreciated this movement, but the finest efforts on his part and on the part of the railway employes were discouragingly discounted by the decision to return the railroads forthwith to their "private owners."

Much criticism has been leveled at the Ad-

ministration for its alleged wasteful increase in the number of employes. The fact is that the eight-hour day, on the basis of common decency and humanity, was established as a general policy. This undoubtedly led to an increase in the number of employes, but it did not add to the number of hours paid for. It is the number of hours worked and not the number of employes which is the significant thing with respect to operating expenses. The following table comparing the totals of railway business for 1916, '17, '18, and '19, with the number of employes and hours worked is very illuminating, not only in disproving the absurd charge mentioned above, but also in revealing the fact that there was an actual increase in the efficiency of the employes under Federal control:

	Calendar years			1919, partly
	1916	1917	1918	estimated
Number of employes	1,647,097	1,723,734	1,820,660	1,891,607
Equated hours worked	5,189,790,716	5,406,878,384	5,641,820,405	5,126,142,664
Revenue ton-miles	362,444,397,129	392,547,347,886	403,070,816,694	363,240,000,000
Passenger miles	34,585,952,026	39,361,369,062	42,498,248,256	46,200,000,000
PER CENT. OF YEAR 1916				
Equated hours worked, per cent	100	104.2	108.7	98.8
Revenue ton-miles " "	100	108.3	111.2	100.2
Passenger miles " "	100	113.8	122.9	133.6
Average hours per employe per month	263	261	258	226

NOTE.—The time worked for about 11 per cent of the employes is reported on a daily basis, and in order to equate these days to hours it has been estimated that these employes have worked on the average 10 hours per day for each of the years covered by the table. As a matter of fact the hours per day of some of these employes reported on a daily basis were less in 1919 than in previous years on account of the establishment of the 8-hour day, but in the absence of accurate statistics all have been assumed to work 10 hours per day in 1919 as well as in the previous years, thus making the showing slightly less favorable to 1919 than it would be if the exact hours worked by daily employes were available.

The Safety Section, as revealed by the annual report of the Division of Operation, made a remarkable record of definite accomplishment during the year 1919, when its work began to tell. The mere fact that the government was the employer and that the workers shared in the administration of matters vitally important to them—representatives of the workers were members of safety committees—had a psychological effect on safety work never possible under private control. The following table will give some idea of what was accomplished:

Progressive results in avoidance of personal injury and death to employes and passengers on Federal-controlled railroads for the eight months of 1919 *ending August* 31 *with the same periods of* 1918 *and* 1917.

[Accidents reported based on Interstate Commerce Commission regulations.]

Period of comparison.	Total train-miles (passenger and freight).	Number killed. Employes.	Number killed. Others.	Number injured. Employes.	Number injured. Others.
Jan. 1 to Aug. 31, 1917	[1]821,742,000	2,163	4,571	117,801	13,186
Jan. 1 to Aug. 31, 1918	777,074,000	2,248	3,951	104,868	11,641
Percentage of decrease of latter period over preceding period, based on units of miles run	.....	9.9	8.6	5.9	6.6
Jan. 1 to Aug. 31, 1919	709,664,000	1,315	3,304	81,471	10,008
Percentage of decrease of latter period over same period of 1918	.....	35.9	8.4	14.9	5.9
Percentage of decrease of period of 1919 over same period of 1917	.....	29.7	16.3	19.9	12.2

[1] These train-miles are estimated, but are believed to be almost exact.

And this, it should be understood, was but a mere beginning, for 80 per cent of railway industrial accidents are preventable.

Public Service

The service which the railroads render to the public is naturally of paramount importance. In this respect, too, all the evidence, nationally compiled and considered, favors Federal control as compared with private control and national and state regulation.

Substantial progress was made in preventing overcharge and loss and damage claims and in their prompt and fair disposition. Most of us are familiar with the usual annoyances and delays encountered in the settlement of freight claims under railway exploitation for profit. The *service motive,* which actuated the Railroad Administration, was able to muster efforts which reduced the total number of loss and damage claims on hand and unsettled from 888,197 on March 1, 1919, to 465,722 on November 1, 1919, a reduction of 48 per cent.[1]

The records show that on the average the percentage of trains on time was as high under Federal control as in former days, and in the case of numerous lines considerably higher, and this despite the fact that there had been practically no addition to passenger equipment and that travel increased under government control from 39 billion to 46 billion passengers carried one mile.

As part of the practical policy of decentralization adopted, the Administration, through the Division of Public Service, cooperated closely with the National Assoc. of Railway Public Utilities Commissioners. Thus the various state public service and utility commissions were linked up directly with the central administration and assisted materially in local matters.

Even more significant than this was the creation of thirty-three freight traffic committees charged with the consideration of applications to modify existing freight rates, rules, and regulations. These committees were conveniently located throughout the country and were composed of an equal number of representatives of the railroad managements and of the shippers, the latter selected through their organizations and confirmed by the Director of Public Service.

Similarly special terminal committees which included representatives of the local shippers concerned were organized in seventy-three of the more important terminals of the country to investigate the movement of freight cars within the terminals, to expedite car movements, to secure heavier loading, and in general to increase terminal and freight car efficiency and service. According to the Director of Public Service most of these committees have done effective work, as might reasonably be expected when responsibility is decentralized and allocated in conformity with basic interests.

Another typical instance of service naturally rendered when a national industry has eliminated the profit motive, is revealed by the establishment of the Committee on Health and Medical Relief of the Railroad Administration. Its functions were to:

"Conduct a survey of, and submit recommendations in connection with, the proper protection of the health of the employes and patrons of the railroads under Federal control."

This committee interested itself in many important phases of preventive medicine and surgery, as made desirable by the railway industry. Among these may be mentioned malaria mosquito control, vaccination, hookworm disease, drinking water supply, venereal disease, and the training of railway industrial surgeons.

It was not until the railroads were put under Federal control that the development of our inland waterways was given the consideration it merited. The Railroad Administration took over the operation of many canals and other water routes and promptly began to organize and develop them on the basis of service in conjunction with rail routes. Much equipment was built and put into operation. Waterway transportation in

[1] The number of loss and damage claims on hand unsettled for a period of more than four months fell from 366,476 on April 1 to 148,683 on November 1, 1919, a reduction of 59 per cent. The number of unsettled overcharge claims more than ninety days old fell from 72,043 on January 31 to 11,102 on September 30, a reduction of 85 per cent.

general was stimulated to the great advantage of the country.

The Cost of Federal Control

In this connection the following taken from Director General Hines' final report is important:

"There is a popular and misleading catch phrase to the effect that 'Federal control has cost' anywhere from $700,000,000 to $1,900,000,000, according to the bent and fervor of the person making the statement.

"As the result of my continuous contact with this subject and repeated discussions concerning it with railroad operating people throughout the country, my deliberate judgment is that Federal control has not cost a cent more than private control would have cost in the same difficult period, but on the contrary has cost considerably less. I believe that the private control which existed in December, 1917, if it had continued during the increasing war stress of 1918, till the armistice, and during the even more difficult period of reconstruction since that time, would have encountered in the aggregate substantially as great increases in cost as the government has encountered and would have been wholly unable to realize many important economies which have been accomplished through unification and which have helped to offset partly the aggregate increases in cost.

"The easy allegation of heavy loss of Federal control, as distinguished from private control, has rested upon the fallacious notion that 'there is no loss unless you see it,' i. e., that there would have been no loss to the public if the public had paid rates high enough to cover the cost, including the rental, and that there is a loss to the public to whatever extent the public has not paid high enough rates to pay such entire cost.

"The fact is that the cost which is paid by the public would certainly not be diminished through increasing the rates. This cost may be paid in full by transportation rates which are in substance a form of special taxation, or may be paid in part out of general taxation; but the public should realize that it does not escape paying the full cost merely because the cost is made less obtrusive through rates being high enough to avoid a deficit to be made good through general taxation. The public has to pay the cost in full in either event."

He also points out that the cost of railroads under government control have been subjected to the same kind of influences which have greatly increased costs to all other industries during and after the war. When comparing the operating expense increases of the United States Steel Corporation with those of the railroads, it is found that the steel corporation's operating costs per unit of production actually increased *more* between 1914 and 1918 than did the cost per unit of railroad service between 1914 and 1919.

Under private control it would either have been necessary to allow the railroads to charge high enough rates to enable them to maintain their independent credit during a period of great financial difficulty, in order that they might borrow the money necessary to make about $1,200,000,000 worth of indispensable improvements during the period of Federal control, or it would have been necessary to do without these improvements because the required capital could not be secured at advantageous rates. In this case the benefits of these improvements would have been lost. Surely, no more eloquent argument than this is needed to prove the real advantages of nationalization.

During Federal control the government paid a total rental to the railroad corporations of $1,956,831,157. Of this all but $677,513,-152 was earned over and above operating expenses. In other words, the Railroad Administration not only met the cost of operating the railroads but actually earned 3.9%, assuming that the guaranteed rental represented 6% on the going worth of the railroads. This is very little, in fact only one-tenth of one per cent., less than what has usually been considered an adequate return on first-class government securities such as Liberty Bonds. Many individual railroad corporations during the period of Federal control, as a result of the general guaranteed rental, received so high a return that, in the words of Senator Cummins, it "shocked the moral sense of mankind." Had the returns to these roads been on a fairer basis, there is no doubt but that this so-called "loss" of $677,513,152 would have been materially reduced.

In this connection it should be stated that certain unusual but very serious influences have existed during Federal control which prevented the Railroad Administration from meeting the guaranteed rentals. The only

railroad rate adjustment amounting to approximately twenty-five per cent increase made during Federal control did not become effective until June, 1918, six months after the government took over the railroads. This alone accounts for a loss of $494,000,000. Similarly the coal strike, the unauthorized shopmen's strike, and the extraordinary slump in business for the six months succeeding the armistice are accountable for a loss of approximately $300,000,000 more. It is utterly ridiculous to argue that private control could have coped with these deficits in any conceivable way. It could not have avoided either the necessity for a very substantial increase in rates, a reduction in wages, or nation-wide railroad bankruptcy followed by the most serious panic the country had ever experienced. This question of the financial success of the degree of nationalization resorted to in behalf of our steam transportation system during the war and reconstruction period can of course be considered from many other viewpoints. The conclusion, however, will always be the same; namely, all things considered, the railroads have never been so well managed as during the period of Federal control, nor have they ever been managed at less relative cost of operation. Infinitely more could have been accomplished if the discouraging element of uncertainty and instability had not been injected into the situation by the President, by Congress, and by the reactionary elements of the nation.

Perhaps the best summarized testimony which can be submitted to show what the distinct achievements of Federal control of our railways have been are the words of Walker D. Hines, taken from his final report to the President:

"These I regard as the results of Federal control:

"It made practicable a war transportation service that could not have been otherwise obtained; its unification practices have increased the utilization of the inadequate supply of equipment so that an exceptionally large transportation service has been performed in the busy periods of 1919 with a minimum of congestion; it met the emergency of the unprecedented coal strike in a way which private control could not have done and absorbed a heavy financial loss on that account which would have proved highly disturbing to private control; it provided more additions and betterments and equipment than private control could have provided during the difficult financial period of 1918 and 1919; it dealt fairly with labor and gave it the benefit of improved and stabilized working conditions which were clearly right; it not only did not cost more than private control would have cost during the same period but cost considerably less on account of the economies growing out of unifications, and the total burden put upon the public (through rates and taxes) on account of railroad costs was substantially less than would have been necessary if the railroads had remained in private control and rates had been raised enough to preserve their credit; it protected the investment in railroad properties, whereas without Federal control those investments would have been endangered; and it turns the railroads back to private control functioning effectively, with a record of exceptional performance in an exceptionally difficult winter, despite the disruption caused by the coal strike, and in condition to function still more effectively with the normal improvement to be expected in the weather and in other conditions."

In conclusion, it is interesting to consider, for a moment, the national railroad situation at this writing, less than ninety days after the end of Federal control. In spite of Government guarantees, revolving funds, and railway labor boards, the so-called benefits of private ownership and competitive management are rapidly lowering the efficiency and the capacity of the American railroads. The morale of the employes is sinking fast. Sporadic "unauthorized" strikes are breaking out. Certain railway officials by insidious methods are attempting to undermine the gains of labor secured during Federal control. Other officials propose to contest the constitutionality of that part of the new railroad law providing for a division of the surplus earnings of certain railroads to help poorer roads. Practically all the large gateways, such as Pittsburg, Chicago, Kansas City, Cincinnati, are suffering badly from blockades and congestion. Freight embargoes are growing in numbers. Skilled railwaymen, when not driven out because of unauthorized strike activities, are leaving the service so that the

shortages of personnel are becoming acute. Chaos is extending rapidly.

The only remedy that seems to occur to those now in control is to increase rates by over a billion, to extend by ten years the availability of the $300,000,000 revolving fund established by Congress, to oppose labor most strenuously in its inevitable contentions for a wage rate in conformity with the growing cost of living. At the end of next August the six-month Government guarantee to the private railway corporations ends. What little stability this provision of the Transportation Act provides will then vanish, and the difficulties of our railway systems will mount to unprecedented heights—unless the public coffers are opened still wider to further underwrite the pathetic system of private ownership and supercomplicated Government regulation as provided by the Transportation Act of 1920.

Realities in Spanish Politics

Luis Araquistain[1]

Translated by Arthur Livingston

MEN and platforms, parliaments and government crises, parties that form and groups that disintegrate, national elections, municipal elections, debates in the press and debates in parliament—these are some of the specters that the observer finds projected upon the screen of Spanish politics. What are the realities behind these shadows? What are the ideas, the interests, the passions, the ultimate causes of this Grand Guignol melodrama which disgusts the native audience and bewilders those who follow it from abroad?

The surprising fact that one encounters on the first approach to Spanish politics is that the French Revolution of 1789 has taken more than a century to establish itself in Spain. The great Spanish revolution began early in the Nineteenth Century. In 1812, under the impulse of the French Revolution and owing to repercussions of the Napoleonic Wars in the Iberian peninsula, the people of Spain pass from absolutism to a constitutional government which transfers sovereignty from the monarch to the nation and parliament. After the return of Ferdinand VII from his abject visit to Bayonne, the pendulum swings back and forth between revolution and counter-revolution for a whole hundred years in Spain. The Spanish Nineteenth Century, such a wretched epoch in appearance, but in reality so very dramatic, is a sustained struggle between two irreconcilable principles, the principle of traditional absolutism and the principle of the constitutionalism of 1812.

The culminating point in this struggle falls in 1868, when Isabella II was dethroned less for her policies than for her scandalous private life. The revolution triumphs over absolutism, but it does not have the courage to dispense with monarchical forms. Spain rummages through all Europe for a king, and after an interregnum of twenty-three months, Amadeo of Savoy, Duke of Aosta, accepts the throne. For the Absolutists, this scion of an anti-papal dynasty is too revolutionary; for the Republicans, he is not radical enough. Don Amadeo endures the strain for slightly over two years. Assailed by the republicans, the army, and the Carlists—these latter the exponents of pure absolutism—the prince of Savoy abdicates. The revolution oversteps the limits of 1812, and the Spanish republic comes into being, a rachitic infant nursed by militarism and absolutism which dies at the end of two years, when the Carlists, the army, and the constitutional monarchists turn against it and call Alfonso XII to the throne.

Demise of Absolutism

The reaction, so-called, of 1874 was, however, a gentle and conciliatory thing. We have been living under it now for fifty years. But under-

[1] This article appears in *The Socialist Review* through the courtesy of the Foreign Press Service.

neath exterior appearances, realities have fundamentally changed. During all this period we have had two monarchical parties, which call themselves Liberal and Conservative, though they might just as well call themselves anything else they chose. They are caricatures and imitations of the two parties, Tory and Liberal, which formed the historic bases of British politics. In reality they had one and the same mission in Spanish life: to watch the republican revolution and the Carlist civil war, and prevent either from reappearing in Spain.

Carlism has long been a corpse in advanced stages of decomposition. The war that has just finished gave Carlism, if not an honored burial, at least a place in the potter's field. Don Jaime, legitimist heir, threw in his lot with the Kaiser, thus deserting the party that supported him in Spain. Spanish absolutism came to a sorry and ridiculous end, expelling the royal leader who inherited its vacuous but still pretentious glories. Absolutism is now captained in Spain by a journalist, and a journalist without genius, Mr. Vasquez de Mella.

Bankruptcy of Republicanism

Republicanism, meanwhile, has been having no better luck. Disillusioned by the turn of affairs in 1874, republicanism has preserved its revolutionary phraseology for fifty years, but without any of the spirit or any of the will of revolution. It has failed to renovate its philosophy and it has gone on trying to produce a revolution by parliamentary means, two errors in tactics, which have stripped it of all strength and all prestige. The decadence of its doctrine and its organization has been accompanied by a corresponding decline in the quality of its leaders. Pi y Margall, Salmaron, Castelar, and the other leaders of '73, left behind them many worshipers, but scarcely a disciple, and, as regards wisdom and personal authority, no successors at all. In recent years, Spanish republicanism has been so thoroughly shadow and so little substance, there has been such a pitiable contrast between its ideal—the restoration of the republic—and the intent and efficacy of its policies, that some of its strongest representatives (the Reformists) have preferred to take their stand on the line of demarcation between republic and monarchy, as offering a better platform for striking the attitudes of revolution—the revolution of Parliaments and Joint Debates. Meanwhile other republicans had gone over to socialism.

Advance of Socialism

Hitherto, the Socialist Party has had but scant political influence, an influence much inferior to the social pressure it has been able to exert through its harmony with the General Union of Workingmen, an organization that embraces the labor unions of all Spain except Catalonia, where its rival, the General Federation of Labor, prevails. The Socialist Party is the brains, so to speak, of the General Union, which is a strictly economic organization. But socialist political efficiency is greatly increasing. Since the Francisco Ferrer episode, it has attracted the republican masses to its tents. The old republican workingman in Spain is still a republican; but he is a socialist as well. Breaking definitely with historical republicanism, socialism, in the elections just past, won more than a thousand municipal councillorships throughout Spain—an unprecedented triumph.

Meanwhile, the men who have hitherto been leaders of historic republicanism are also abandoning their ancient standard. They are beginning to realize that the prevailing regime, monarchical though it be, but still conserving private property, is more favorable to their interests than a revolution which may begin with a moderate republic but end Heaven knows where.

Instability of Cabinets

Both these factors, decadence in doctrine and leadership, and demoralization of forces—the workers going to the left and the bourgeois elements to the right, have made of Spanish republicanism a specter almost as pathetic and insubstantial as Carlism. It would seem, in fact, that this dissolution of republicanism and Carlism indicated the definitive triumph

of the Restoration of 1874. In reality, it is a serious threat to the monarchy. While its two historic enemies were healthy and vigorous, the monarchy's two great pivotal parties stood compact, solidified by fear of revolution on the one hand and civil war on the other. But now that the traditional opposition has broken down, the liberal and conservative parties have become the instruments of the rivalry and ambition of their important men. Today there are three conservative cliques headed by Dato, Maura, and Cierva, and three liberal cliques headed by Romanones, Prieto, and Alba. Inside each group there are various minor combinations animated likewise by personal motives.

This division and subdivision of political forces have all but put parliamentary government out of existence. Nothing but so-called concentrated or coalition governments are possible—governments, that is, by compromises between groups, which are now of a single party, liberal or conservative, and now of mixed composition, liberal and conservative. But such governments have no stability, because the purpose of each group leader is to get control of the whole combination; and, to get power or keep some one else from getting it, any one of them is ready to provoke a crisis on any or no pretext, in the hope that the readjustment may win him a coveted position. This has been at the bottom of the numberless changes of ministries that Spain has passed through in recent years. Such changes express the orgy of passion and ambition the monarchical groups have been indulging in from the moment the pressure of Carlism and republicanism was removed. Though these leaders are indifferent, apparently, to the discredit their conduct brings upon the monarchy, the monarchy cannot do without them. For it is a characteristic trait of modern Spain that the men of the younger generations, disgusted with the prevailing politics, either enter the extremist parties or withdraw to a disdainful aloofness. The blood of the monarchical parties is never renewed. The same spectral figures succeed each other in wearisome rotation. The monarchy has only one source of reserve vitality to draw on: the Reformist party. But since this party is but conditionally monarchistic, the monarchy is afraid to trust it, not only because its reforms might go too far in a social sense, but because one of its specific demands is for a Constituent Assembly which would refer the whole question of retaining the monarchy to the people.

Spanish politics thus present a picture: Carlism, dead; republicanism, moribund; and, as a result, the historic monarchical parties in full decadence, given over to a Byzantine struggle of political appetites.

The Creative Forces

What, then, are the vital, the creative forces? They are three.

At the extreme left of the social revolutionary movement stands syndicalism—a movement now much weakened, and confined to the province of Catalonia and a few scattered points in Spain. Catalonian (anarchical) syndicalism is not a menace to the Spanish established order.

Farther to the right, if not in ideals, at least in tactics, comes socialism—a movement in process of rapid numerical growth at the expense of historic republicanism.

At the extreme right come all the elements of "law and order," who have fled from all the spectral parties, republican or monarchical, and tend to concentrate around some man of supposed strength who used to be Maura, a man now old and ill, and who is about to be Cierva or some general of the army. This group would be the party of the social counter-revolution.

To complete the picture, we must note, in the center, the Reformist Party which is a sort of bridge between two Spains that are becoming separated more and more by an ever widening gulf. But above this array of parties and forces is the Crown, bewildered, vacillating, not knowing which way to turn or upon what party or set of forces to base its strength, whether on the right or on the left, on the army or on the civil population, on parliament or on a dictatorship, going and

coming, in doubt, inaction, and despair. Underneath, as the basis of all political action, or if you wish, behind the political scenery and pulling the wires for the various marionettes to move, is the army, represented for the moment in the military juntas and making itself actively felt whenever the civil power is disturbed.

Thus, in Spain, the revolutionary process which began in 1812 proceeds on its course. Only men and ideals have changed, for what began as a political revolution now includes in its purview the whole foundation of the social order. It is a drama being played with both specters and realities on the stage. The important thing is to distinguish the shadow from the substance; because in Spain, as in other parts of the world, civilization is facing one of its most critical moments.

Danish and Dutch Strikes

Marian Tyler

DIRECT actionists will find a serviceable argument in the Danish success of early April. Its full results, industrial and political, cannot even yet be determined.

The history of the affair is generally familiar. The population of Central Schleswig and Flensburg, in the plebiscite provided by the treaty terms, voted by about three to one to return to Germany. This distressed the Danish nationalists, who suddenly acquired the closest ties of affection and disinterested sentiment for Flensburg, a prosperous seaport. The press was filled with long and eloquent letters by former Flensburgians who had emigrated. It was arranged that a deputation from Flensburg should present a petition to the Allied Commission complaining of fraud at the plebiscite. Should this fail, it was planned to negotiate for the internationalization of the territory.

Against these demonstrations of chauvinism the socialist and labor population of Denmark protested vigorously by meetings and in the press. The socialist-liberal cabinet especially held out for self-determination. Then the king sprang his *coup d'état*. Just as the Rigsdag was about to adjourn for its Easter recess, he sent for Premier Zahle, and requested the resignation of his ministry. Zahle having refused, the king issued a decree dismissing the entire cabinet.

Christian seems to have been surprised by the explosion of anger which his match lit. In the first place he was a good deal inconvenienced by the refusal of the old cabinet to serve until he could replace it. Then his decree was pronounced unconstitutional, although the machinery was not at hand to reverse it. The General Assembly of Trade Unions pounced on his action with peremptory demands, and ordered a general strike, to be effective April 6; 25,000 workers, in anticipation of this event, walked out on March 30. The socialist group in the Rigsdag issued a manifesto proclaiming a republic. Worst of all, the crowds in the street and in front of the palace kept shouting, "Down with the king! Hurrah for the republic!"

The royal trepidation was such that ex-Minister of Labor Stauning was summoned and implored to avert the strike. Stauning, who two days after his dismissal must have enjoyed the interview, replied that it was too late. His Majesty also received the burgomaster of Copenhagen, in response to whose distressed appeal he promised to consider the consequences of his action. Meanwhile he conferred at length with his new prime minister, Liebe.

"The Danish trade union organization," to quote Paul Louis in *l'Humanité*, "is closely bound with the socialist organization, whose doctrines and program it accepts. The same men direct both sides." The trade union movement represents over ten per cent of the population. Its discipline is excellent, and its temper moderate, capable of deliberate and sustained revolutionary action. Plans

for the strike were made systematically. On April 1 the General Assembly of Trade Unions adopted the following resolution:

"The assembly has learned with indignation of the king's action. It approves the measures taken by direction of the Socialist Party, and invites the professional organizations to join a general strike for the purpose of obtaining the convocation of the Rigsdag, the application of the new electoral right as well as of new and honest elections, the solution of the present workers' difficulty, the payment of supplementary wages in proportion to the increased cost of living, and the opening of negotiations to let the workers participate in the direction of all enterprise.

"The professional organizations are invited to take every measure to make the general strike fully effective from the morning of Tuesday the sixth of April.

"The following are exempt from the strike: hospitals, asylums for children and the aged, gas and water service, and the police.

"Professional organizations are also invited to begin the strike immediately in order to assure the execution of the preceding decisions, and to maintain order everywhere."

Premier Liebe told a deputation from the trade unions that new elections would be held April 22, and added, for the king, "I will negotiate everything when the general strike is called off." A chorus of socialist councillors answered, "It is too late, your Majesty."

When practically all the workers except the government employes in the railroads and other public services had gone out, and hope of averting the strike had been almost abandoned, a capitulation was arranged which conceded virtually all the workers' demands. A new cabinet was formed, consisting of department heads without regard to political affiliations. Electoral reform bills were framed, new elections promised, amnesty granted all political prisoners. It was understood that the new cabinet should accept the result of the Schleswig plebiscite, although this question was subordinated to internal issues.

Immediately after the achievement of these political victories, and before the strike order was cancelled, the unions insisted on a conference with employers' associations. The general lockout which had been ordered for April 9 because the employers thought wages too high and the workers too independent, was called off, and additional recognition and control in the management of industries were promised the unions. Definite negotiations for socialization of industry were initiated, with the prospect of accomplishing the readjustment before the end of the present year.

The general strike did not occur, neither was the king deposed. The rehearsal, however, is generally considered to have been successful.

Dutch Harbor Strike

The strike of harbor workers in Dutch ports, although less important and spectacular than the Danish situation, illustrates a new international technique. The strike lasted through most of March and April, tying up at least two hundred ships in Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The Holland-America line admits that its service was crippled for at least three weeks.

When the strike was several weeks old, funds were exhausted, and strike-breakers were operating the service with increasing success. Now the British harbor workers had just won a strike for a minimum daily wage of sixteen shillings. The London *Daily Herald* of March 27 carried an appeal for help for the Dutch workers in obtaining an equivalent minimum. The response was immediate. Dockers at Liverpool refused to unload a vessel manned by "blacklegs," and cargoes were returned to Holland.

At the time of writing, the settlement cannot be learned in New York. It is known, however, that the men went back to work April 26, presumably under improved conditions and at increased pay.

Reading Notice

Articles by Eugene Bagger on "What About Hungary?", by Arthur Gleason on "Origins of British Socialism," and by William Pickens, entitled "Jim-Crowed," together with many book reviews, are held over for next issue.

Socialist Unity

Eugene V. Debs

[*Excerpts from a letter to David Karsner dated April 30, 1920. Published in full in the N. Y. Call.*]

"FOR myself, I attach no great importance to my views and opinions upon party matters. I am as apt to be wrong as anyone. I may be entirely wrong now, as I have been many times in the past. It is my *purpose* only that I hold true and I have no fear of that being questioned.

"I have said and I want to repeat that there is no fundamental difference, in my opinion, between the great majority of the rank and file of the three parties: no difference that will not yield to sound appeal in the right spirit. Mistakes have been made on all sides, mistakes aggravated by the war hysteria, and with these candidly admitted an understanding is possible that will embrace a vast majority of all the factions that composed the party prior to the separation. It is not too much to say that I personally know most of the members of all these factions, and I know them to be equally loyal and true, and equally eager to serve the cause.

"That there are obstacles in the way of unity, and serious ones, it were foolish to deny, but I believe they can be overcome, and if not, then at least there can be a truce on the eve of the battle so that we may enter the campaign with a united front and make the most of the greatest opportunity ever presented to us since the day we were organized.

"If I understand it correctly the Socialist Party is the only one of the three that has not been outlawed, at least temporarily, and we either have to enter the campaign as the Socialist Party or not at all, and this being true, why not go into the fight with all our forces united and make the issue so clear and luminous that the enemy will have to face it and thus give us the opportunity for propaganda and action in behalf of our cause that we have never had before and may not have again for years to come? The conditions are ripe; the people are ready; the hour is here. It is up to us! How big are we, or how small? Shall we unite and fight the great political battle before us in behalf of the working class, or shall we turn and rend one another, or seek advantage of one another in factional strife, or talk about our difference or our indifference, and thereby betray the cause by allowing the supreme opportunity to pass by unimproved? Differences there will always be, especially among Socialists, and fortunately so, but wise men profit by their differences and do not permit themselves to be throttled by them.

"For myself, I have no stomach for factional quarreling and I refuse to be consumed in it. If it has to be done others will have to do it. I can fight capitalists but not comrades. It takes all I have in the way of time and strength to face the front and fight the foe. I do not object to fighting among ourselves, if fighting there has to be, but I do insist that we shall be decent and fight clean, and not sink to the level and resort to the methods of ward-heeling politicians.

"Some comrades were discouraged by the unseating of our comrades at Albany. Not I. Quite the contrary. That was our greatest political victory. The ruling capitalists now recognize in our movement a menacing force to their corruption and misrule, and they have foolishly set about to sit down upon it. Now watch them—and us, if we are not as foolish as they.

"Some other comrades were inclined to renounce political action after the Albany experience. Not I. The unseating of those five comrades has shaken the whole country. They are talking about it in Maine and California, and down here in Georgia, and it is all in our favor.

"We have lost and won; they have won and lost!

"More than ever, if that be possible, do I believe in political action—not in vote chasing or office seeking, but in political propaganda and action, and there is a vast difference between them.

"The Socialist Party is primarily a political party. It is more than that, but it is certainly all of that or it is nothing at all and should disband. If I did not believe, and believe thoroughly, in political action as one of the essential means of waging the class struggle, I would not be in the Socialist Party, not a minute. I can understand those who lay the entire emphasis on industrial action and I can coöperate with them in all harmony. I see no necessity for friction or misunderstanding. What I object to is the pretense of political action to screen hostility or indifference to it. If all are either for or against it in real earnest we shall have no trouble in adjusting ourselves accordingly.

"The political appeals, if rightly made and properly supported, can be made most potent and effective in the promotion of our cause and for obvious reasons, I think, this is especially true here in the United States. To secure the maximum of results we should go into politics our whole length and with our full strength; we should have a sound platform and a complete ticket, and we should fight each battle along clean and uncompromising lines.

"In this hour we need as never before faith of granite in our cause—the supreme cause of mankind. We need the sublime faith the cause inspires in us and in each other, and the enthusiasm that leaps from the soul of a warrior like a divine flame, and all we need to fear is that we may shirk some share of our duty and responsibility.

"There can be no doubt regarding the temper and attitude of the forward looking American people toward our movement. All the powers of capitalism are exhausted in vain to misrepresent it. Hundreds of thousands are today sympathetic who but yesterday were hostile. They know in spite of all the deceit and falsehood made to serve against our cause that we stand for real democracy and self-government and the essential rights and liberties of the people. And this year, if we but give them the chance, they will rally to our standard, and I am fully persuaded that if we lay aside all differences of the past, as far as may be, buckle on our armor and plunge into the struggle with all our might, heedless of all else, touching shoulders all along the battle line, when the smoke has cleared away and we emerge from the conflict we shall be so welded together, so completely one in solidarity and sympathy and understanding that there will be little inclination to part company and reestablish a divided and discordant household."

The Amalgamated on Trial

Jessica Smith

"WE would like to be relieved from any obligation to have the history of the Labor Movement in America in this lawsuit. We are bringing it to compel these people to leave us alone, and to mind their own business and let us pursue our own way. That is all we have got into court for."

Attorney Sutherland thus expressed the attitude of the plaintiff, Michaels, Stern & Co., of Rochester, N. Y., towards the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, against whom they seek a permanent injunction, with payment of $100,000 damages alleged to have been suffered during the strike of last summer. Mr. Sutherland uttered these words in the course of Sidney Hillman's testimony, as he felt the case getting away from a mere bickering over petty acts of violence to a discussion of the fundamental economics of the situation.

This case involves the vital issue of whether the whole base of legal procedure is to be broadened to include the general social and

economic significance of a given act. Attorney Sutherland considers such matters "incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial," and Judge Rodenbeck upholds him by ruling out all evidence not directly connected with the particular strike under consideration. We must therefore explore for ourselves to get sufficient background to judge the case.

From Chaos to Organization

The Amalgamated, under the brilliant leadership of Sidney Hillman, has become one of the most powerful factors in the industrial world. Each improvement accomplished in wages, hours, and conditions of work has been accompanied by an advance in the efficiency of production and has meant increased stability in the industry.

Prior to 1914, the clothing trade displayed a shameful record of sweatshop work, long hours, and inadequate wages. There came a series of unorganized, spasmodic strikes. In themselves, they were for the most part futile, bringing only temporary gains, because of the chaotic general condition of the industry, the instability of employment, and the unregulated competition among manufacturers. Out of these early strikes, however, there emerged a definite purpose on the part of the workers, to better their conditions through the development of unionism. A few men, without vision, without social philosophy, saw in the union movement a chance for individual advancement, and for a time the conservative, political type of leader was in control. At the 1914 convention of the United Garment Workers, a group came to the front with the charge that President Rickert and other officials were unjustly and unlawfully excluding certain locals from an opportunity to express their wishes. Their demands ignored, the insurgents withdrew, formed a rival convention, and organized a new body, severing all connection with the A. F. of L. Subsequently, they took the name of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, and with Sidney Hillman as president, have become an increasingly dominant force in the labor world, not only creating ever higher standards for the workers, but bringing peace and stability to the clothing industry as a whole.

Growth of Membership

The membership has grown from some 30,000 in 1914, to 165,000 at the present time. From a single agreement with Hart, Schaffner and Marx, in Chicago, the organization has spread, until today it includes from 85 per cent. to 90 per cent. of the entire market. A significant commentary on the growth of the union is embodied in the fact that whereas in the beginning it represented a comparatively small number of workingmen determinded to fight for their rights against the organized employing forces of the country, powerfully intrenched in the capitalist system, we have today a group of those same employers protesting that not only their individual existence, but the whole structure of society is threatened by the organized force of a single union.

Meantime, the United Garment Workers have become practically defunct, and are organized in a negligible percentage of the clothing firms, notably the overall trade. Their methods have been short-sighted and inefficient. They have come into prominence in the last few years chiefly as strikebreakers. In the present instance, after the Amalgamated had called the strike, Arthur Stern personally made a trip to New York to secure a charter from the United Garment Workers, and himself put up money for dues. The Rochester local of that union, which comprised about ten members, had previously refused to organize the men in the Michaels, Stern & Co. plant.

Wages in Clothing Industry

An examination of the wages in the clothing industry for the last six years, taken from a survey of the principal markets, shows that the average increase has been over 154 per cent., which leaves a comfortable increase over the cost of living in the same period. The greatest increase has been 212 per cent. in New York, the lowest, 107 per cent., in Rochester. In 1914, the average earning of the

workers, making allowance for unemployment, was $719 a year, 20 per cent. less than was needed to maintain the minimum subsistence budget of about $860, determined by impartial investigators. At that time 35 per cent. of the workers in the entire industry were receiving between $10 and $15 a week, 27 per cent. received between $5 and $10, and less than 3 per cent. over $25. That the Amalgamated has been the chief agency in securing wage increases is demonstrated by the fact that the wage level in different cities varies according to the degree to which the market is organized. It is true that market conditions created by the present demand for clothing, and the shortage of labor due to lack of immigration during the war, have compelled non-union shops to come up to the standard of union shops. But that is only temporary, for when slack periods come the non-union shops have no scruples against lowering wages and endangering the standards of the industry. The union has consistently operated as a stabilizing factor, and during the war, when the competition for labor was acute, it prevented inordinate wage increases, and used its power to keep wages down to the level agreed upon.

Working Hours

A survey of working hours during these years tells the same story. In 1914, no one worked under 48 hours a week, almost one-fourth worked between 48 and 51 hours, and over one-half from 51 to 54. By the first part of 1919, no one was working over 48 hours a week, 85 per cent. were working at 48, 15 per cent. under 48. In the summer of 1919, the 44-hour week was established in the entire industry. The shorter work day has meant a reduction of seasonal unemployment, a problem which has for years baffled employers, and it has also meant increased output per man.

These achievements, and many others, have been made possible only through the development of collective bargaining, and the arbitration method of settling disputes without recourse to strikes. Formerly, when the worker was forced to deal directly with his employer, his first thought was to hold his job, and little progress was possible. As Sidney Hillman explained on the witness stand, in repeating a conversation with Arthur Stern:

"For the first time a system whereby justice can be done to everyone is introduced. In the old days, under the old system, the whole conduct of relations between employers and employes in our industry was a matter of position. If the employers had the power, they enforced intolerable conditions on the workers, and if the workers were only temporarily organized, they had no sense of proportion, and at times made it impossible for the firm to run their business. . . . The success of the Amalgamated is due to the fact that they have always guarded the interests of the industry, for while a labor organization can defeat an employer, it can never defeat an industry without injury to itself."

How the Amalgamated Works

Under the present system a shop deputy is elected directly by the workers of his own shop. The deputy takes up the grievances with the labor manager. If a satisfactory agreement cannot be reached in this way, the matter is referred to a higher union official, and a representative of the firm as a whole. Questions that are still unsettled are then referred to the arbitration board, composed of representatives of both sides, for adjustment, and the final and binding decision is made by an impartial chairman. Through these decisions a uniform body of laws has been built up for the entire industry.

Nor does the work of the union stop within the factory walls. Educational work has an important place on the union program, and while the court examines speeches of the workers for un-American implications, the union continues to hold its classes designed to prepare the workers for constructive American citizenship. There are classes in civics, parliamentary law, economics, English—and the cultural side of the worker's life is developed through evenings devoted to music, dancing, and drama.

The Amalgamated rests its case before the public on this record of achievement. In the

courtroom, the case is narrowed to the issue of whether the strike in Rochester was called for the illegal purpose of putting the plaintiff out of business, and furthered by illegal methods. The first charge against the Union is answered in its larger sense by the unadmitted evidence, which proves economic justification; in its legal sense by the law of the State of New York, which permits labor to strike to better its conditions. As for the charge of violence, the plaintiff was able to prove little more than a certain amount of mass intimidation, and a few police court cases which might occur where any crowd gathered. Much of the evidence submitted by Michaels, Stern & Co. proved damaging to their own case. They could not conceal the fact that the company had consistently fought the union; that they had refused to abide by the Ripley-Kirstein decision and give to the workers the back pay due under the agreement accepted by the other manufacturers of Rochester; that they had maintained a spy system, and discharged workers for union activities; that the agreement with the United Garment Workers was not made in good faith, but as a weapon with which to fight the Amalgamated.

The Amalgamated has demonstrated that only through the increasing control of industry by the workers is progress possible. This organization has vigor and vision, backed by sound pragmatic philosophy. While it never loses sight of the general movement of the workers out of the status of wage earners, it realizes that each improvement must be made to work under existing conditions. In the larger sense, the union has already won the real fight at Rochester. While Michaels, Stern & Co. battle against the tide, the Amalgamated holds its annual convention, plans for a 40-hour week, for the development of co-operative stores and banks, and endorses the movement for welding together all of the needle workers of the country in a single, invincible organization. Injunctions and damage suits may act as temporary setbacks, but they cannot stop the urge that drives the workers forward to the realization of a freer life.

Debs in 1920

David Karsner

FOR the first time in the history of American politics a man has been nominated for president of the United States while serving a prison sentence. Eugene Victor Debs, of Indiana, now federal prisoner No. 9653 at Atlanta, for the fifth time candidate for president on the Socialist Party ticket, is serving a ten-year sentence for violating the Espionage Law by voicing his opposition to the war on June 16, 1918, before the Ohio Socialist Party State Convention. Ample American precedent exists to support the supposition that American citizens have a constitutional right to disagree with governmental acts without being convicted of crime. In every past war in which America has taken part citizens have disagreed with the participation of their government without being jailed for a mere expression of opinion. During the Civil War the Democratic Party met in convention and denounced the war as a failure. Yet its leaders were not hunted by the agents of the Department of Justice.

It is perfectly true that the Socialist Party, to which Debs belongs and which he helped to found, adopted a platform during the last war deprecating and "opposing" war. But war, in its last analysis and ultimate aspect, is a very personal matter, and no political platform or party fiat can hope to control the personal feelings of its members.

The St. Louis platform of the Socialist Party, adopted in April, 1917, had very little effect upon persons affiliated with the Socialist Party, except to excite their natural abhorrence to all war, and, in some instances, to bring persons into legal and military conflict with the government of the United States. But as a party, the Socialists really

did not carry into effect their anti-war declarations. There were some socialist conscientious objectors to military duty. There were also objectors from other classes and organizations, not necessarily radical, but political and religious. Jack Dempsey, the champion pugilist, ran afoul the military rule as a draft evader, and Grover Bergdoll, the scion of a wealthy family of brewers in Philadelphia, was hunted for two years before captured as a draft dodger.

Champ Clark, then speaker of the Lower House of Congress, took the floor and made a speech against our entrance into it. He also voted against the declaration of war. The Democratic Party was not steeped in odium because of this, nor was the Republican Party denounced because Congressman James R. Mann, at that time minority leader of the House, opposed our entrance into the war. The government had plenty of cause to sense the fact that the Socialist Party could not control its membership in opposing the war, for a bakers' dozen of prominent socialists dropped their radical affiliations and aided in the war.

But because Debs made a speech in Ohio to his followers expressing his disapproval of the war in which the nation was then engaged, he was arrested, indicted, tried, and convicted, and sentenced to serve ten years in prison. It is germane to the subject of this article to mention this situation for the reason that from the moment the prison doors closed behind Eugene V. Debs on April 13, 1919, at the state penitentiary, Moundsville, West Virginia, Debs became the martyr of the socialist and liberal movements of the United States, and, indeed one of the martyrs of the world. From the moment of his imprisonment his name won added significance and power, on both sides of the Atlantic. The common people knew that a man had gone to prison with the full knowledge that no stigma of guilt attached itself to him, and that he was more than willing to pay the full price for his principles.

Debs and the Presidency

On the night of April 12, 1919, I was with Debs on the train riding from his home in Terre Haute, Indiana, to Cleveland where he was going to surrender himself to the federal marshal, who would escort him to prison. It occurs to me now that I said to Debs on that occasion:

"Your imprisonment will certainly tend to accelerate whatever boom would otherwise have been started for you for president. If the socialists in convention again nominate you, would you consent to make the run?"

"There is better timber in the woods than I," Debs replied. "Let me see. The presidential campaign is two years away. Why, in two years I'll be the best swabber of floors or the best prison clerk in Moundsville."

Perhaps that was the first reference made directly to Debs of his running again for the presidency. But from the moment that that reference was printed in the New York *Call* the socialist press of the entire country took up the suggestion and from that time until May 13, 1920, when the National Socialist Convention in New York nominated Debs for president, the rank and file of the membership of the Socialist Party did not give a thought to any other candidate. He was the idol of the masses! They *would* have him! They made their demands upon him, a prisoner, in certain tones, and Debs heard them through the stone walls and the steel bars of Atlanta federal prison.

During my numerous interviews with Debs in Moundsville and Atlanta prisons, his possible nomination was mentioned by myself only in a casual and general way and merely in order to acquaint him with the feeling and activity of his comrades. For one solid year Debs kept absolutely quiet on the matter of his nomination for president, which was a foregone conclusion so far as the membership of his party was concerned.

It was not until March 12, 1920, two months before the day on which he was nominated, that he expressed himself in definite terms. I know for a certainty that after the campaign of 1912, in which Debs was the Socialist Party candidate for the fourth time, he firmly resolved never again to permit his

name to come before the Socialist Convention. In 1916 the Socialist Party did not hold a national convention and its candidates for president and vice-president were chosen by a referendum vote of the party membership.

In that year Debs ran for Congress from the district that embraces Terre Haute. Despite his firm resolve not to run for office he felt that he could not refuse the insistent demands of his own state organization. Debs has always taken the position that he owes his body and soul to the socialist movement and he is ready and willing at all times to pay the bill that it exacts from him despite his personal wishes to the contrary. Socialism comes first in the life of 'Gene Debs, and everything, every other consideration follows in the train of his first love.

On my visit to him March 12 last, Debs signified that he would permit his name to go before the National Socialist Convention as the presidential candidate by signing his name to a document which certified that his name had been correctly placed on a proof ballot which was voted on at the presidential primary elections in the state of Michigan on April 5. It was merely an accident that I happened to witness that event. The document had been sent to Debs' office in Terre Haute by the county clerk of Calhoun County, Michigan, and while I was visiting his brother, Theodore Debs, at that moment the latter asked me to take the letter to Debs since I was going to Atlanta from Terre Haute.

At the moment of placing his signature to that document Debs said:

"I do not know whether I should do this. I have always been exceedingly reluctant to accept any honors from the party. I have felt that the best way I could serve was in the ranks, fighting shoulder to shoulder with my comrades, and I would not for anything in the world have a single comrade think for one moment that I seek to be candidate for president. I have been actuated solely by one motive in the past, and that was to serve the socialist movement in the best way that it thought I could serve it. I do not know now if this is the best way."

From coast to coast the news traveled that Debs would accept the nomination for president, and the information sent a thrill and a throb through every lover of liberty in the United States. Leading libertarians of Europe, including Jean Longuet and George Bernard Shaw, expressed their approval and admiration. In the American socialist and liberal press the news was greeted with large headlines of approval, and in mass meetings with cheers and applause.

So it was then that the Socialist National Convention in New York on May 13 merely set its stamp of official approval upon Debs' nomination. It is doubtful if ever before a political convention met with its mind so united and riveted upon accomplishing one aim as the socialist convention that has just nominated Debs. The party members had indicated their choice long before the delegates assembled in New York, and the delegates joyously and with unbounded enthusiasm obeyed the will of their constituency.

A Challenge to Reaction

The nomination of Debs at this time and under these circumstances is a direct challenge to the administration of the United States for the prosecution and persecution of several thousand men and women who disapproved of the administration's policies during and after the war. The recognized leader of a political party has been thrown in prison, not for *opposing*, but for *disapproving* of the war. Very well, say the members of that party, we will nominate him for president and appeal to the voters to support our ticket as a protest against his imprisonment, and likewise the imprisonment of all other persons convicted under the Espionage Law—a wartime statute, which in letter and spirit reduced the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, and the First Amendment to the Constitution to myths, rumors, and political vagaries.

With Debs in prison the Socialist Party's platform and declaration of principles for 1920 must, therefore, find second place with the greater issue for 1920—the restitution of the people's civil liberties, the restoration of

the constitutional guarantees for free speech, free press, and free assemblage, and the immediate release of all persons confined in federal and state prisons under the espionage law, and later under the "criminal syndicalist law." The last statute has been enacted in a number of states in order to imprison active persons working in behalf of unpopular causes. In spirit it does not differ from the espionage law, a federal statute which is automatically repealed with the declaration of peace by this country with Germany and Austria-Hungary. The "criminal syndicalist law" merely passes on to the states the obligation of punishing persons of revolutionary, radical, or unpopular opinions which the administration fulfilled so thoroughly, ruthlessly, and rigorously with the aid of the espionage law.

The socialist movement this year finds itself divided into three groups, the Communist Party, Communist Labor Party, and the Socialist Party. This division occurred at Chicago, in September, 1919,[1] when the Socialist Party met in an emergency convention. The basic cause of this division was over the question of tactics. The Socialist Party held to political action as the means of accomplishing social and economic change, while the other factions would supplement political action (if used at all) with revolutionary measures. A divorce of that character and based upon those grounds was not new to the Socialist Party, since it went through a similar experience in the Indianapolis convention in 1912 when the convention went on record in Article 2, Section 6 of the party constitution as opposing violent and revolutionary tactics, or the advocacy of them by members of the Socialist Party. This clause alienated all those members who were affiliated with the Industrial Workers of the World, led by William D. Haywood, who had been a member of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party.

Debs was not in favor of "Article 2, Section 6," although he has never countenanced nor counselled the use of violence and force in the battles of the workers against the capitalist system. It was his position then that a political party should not legislate against an industrial organization and dictate the manner in which it should emancipate its members. On the other hand, the I. W. W. has never counselled violence or force, in spite of the terrific amount of force and violence that has been used against it by the capitalist class, individually and collectively.

The present schism within the socialist movement has given Debs much concern, and he has done everything in his power to heal the wounds. On April 12, 1920, when I visited him at Atlanta on the occasion of his first year's imprisonment, he deprecated the split and urged upon the Socialist Party to do what it could to accomplish unity, at least in the national convention and during the campaign. He requested that the National Executive Committee of the party invite the Communist groups to send their fraternal delegates to the convention. There was no desire on the part of the leadership of the party to hold out to the Communists the olive palm. Indeed, there was bitterness and distrust on both sides that went deeper than the leaders, permeating practically the whole membership of the socialist movement.

On the question of socialist unity I quoted Debs at length in an interview that was printed in *The Call* on April 15, the substance of which was confirmed by Debs himself in a letter addressed to me from Atlanta Prison on April 30.[2] This letter is important for the reason that there might arise a suspicion in the Communist groups that Debs himself has compromised his militant position by running as a candidate for the Socialist Party. Debs, by his letter from prison, made a heroic gesture at bridging the gap between the divergent groups, and since the gap still exists, and will very likely continue, it is no fault of Debs, and he who will rise to state that Eugene V. Debs has compromised himself by accepting the nomination for President on the regular Socialist Party

[1] See *The Three Conventions* by Harry W. Laidler. *Socialist Review* for January, 1920.

[2] See "Socialist Unity" on page 15.

ticket is grossly misinformed. Although in 1912 Debs disapproved of the act that resulted in the separation of the industrial and political wings of the party, he still remained with the Socialist Party, and his vote in that year was 897,011, almost doubling his vote in 1908, which was 420,973.

Politics with Debs is merely one gesture and he does not place absolute and implicit faith in the ballot as the only means by which the workers might accomplish the task of socializing and humanizing the nation and the world. He is a great humanist, a simple man, a lover of his fellows, a hater of all that degrades humanity, a prophet of the new order, a man destined to take his place in history beside those martyrs of old, Giordano Bruno, Jan Huss, Savonarola, Robert Emmett, John Brown, and Wendell Phillips.

I like to remember the fine, brave words of Debs when he addressed the National Socialist Convention in 1904, accepting the nomination for President:

"In the councils of the Socialist Party the collective will is supreme. Personally, I could have wished to remain in the ranks, to make my record, humble though it might be, fighting unnamed and unhonored, side by side with my comrades. I accept your nomination, not because of any honor it confers—for in the socialist movement no comrade can be honored except as he honors himself by his fidelity to the movement. I accept your nomination because of the confidence it implies, because of the duty it imposes. I cannot but wish that I may in a reasonable measure meet your expectations; that I may prove myself fit and worthy to bear aloft in the coming contest the banner of the working class; that by my utterances and by my acts, not as an individual, but as your representative, I may prove myself worthy to bear the standard of the only party that proposes to emancipate my class from the thralldom of the ages. . . .

"To concentrate myself to my part in this great work is my supreme ambition. I can only hope to do that part which is expected of me so well that my comrades, when the final verdict is rendered, will say, 'He is not remembered because he was a candidate for President; he did not aspire to hold office; he did not try to associate his name with passing glories, but he did prove himself a worthy member of the Socialist Party; he proved his right to a place in the International Socialist Movement. . . .'

"From the depths of my heart I thank you. I thank you and each of you, and through you those you represent. I thank you not from my lips merely. I thank you from the depths of a heart that is responsive to your consideration. We shall meet again. We shall meet often. And when we meet finally we shall meet as a triumphant host to ratify the triumph of the Socialist Republic."

Spring in 1920

Miriam Allen deFord

There is sun on the hills and the trees are soft with flowers:
  Heart, O heart! Can you not be joyous too?
Master, there be many for whom the lengthening hours
  Bring but the memory of a freedom once they knew!

The birds pile their nests and trill ballads for their mating:
  Heart, O heart! Can you not rejoice with these?
Master, there be many to whom the iron grating
  Lets in the mockery of an April-scented breeze!

Youth is in the world and the air's alight with laughter:
  Heart, O heart! Can you not be glad of spring?
Master, there be many whom darkness follows after;
  And I shall not be merry till the jail-walls sing!

The National Convention

"We Want Debs"

W. Harris Crook

DURING the morning of Thursday, May 13, the Convention Hall had rung with discussion, division, and dispute. Left wing and right wing had each had a hand in it. Tucker, of Illinois, tall in stature, emphatic in delivery, rhetorical in diction, with a frequent smile flickering in eyes that were keen as rapier blades, had moved the "minority" platform, declaring that the official (Hillquit) draft sounded more like "a funeral oration over the Socialist Party" than a fighting platform. The right wing—largely dominating in numbers—had resented such expressions and at least one speaker, a labor editor from the Middle West, had gone so far as to declare it useless to try to harmonize the two wings "where harmony was impossible." So fiercely raged the dispute, so heated was the atmosphere that chairman Judge Panken's gavel-head parted company with the handle, and flying off at a tangent landed with much vigor upon an unlucky reporter's brainpan—"the first time," as the Judge remarked, "that a capitalist paper got it in the neck."

A stranger to conventions, and to radical conventions in particular, would have wagered large sums on an imminent split in the party gathering. Had the stranger waited till the hour of two that same afternoon he would have marvelled at his own lack of prescience and at socialist power of unity that does not require a barren uniformity. A miniature pandemonium was reigning at 1.58, with Meyer London, of New York, in the midst of the whirlwind vainly striving to make himself heard on the League of Nations. Two moments later a dead silence had fallen upon delegates and audience alike, the latter packed like sardines in the crowded gallery, as Judge Panken called upon delegate Henry of Indiana.

Six feet high, heavily built, and somewhat slow of speech, Edward Henry made the nomination for President of the United States on the Socialist ticket with a simple, brief but highly emotional speech. He described his recent visit to Atlanta and his reception by Debs, and spoke of him as "the best beloved man in the United States." The audience rose to the speech, emotion and all, with wildest transports of cheering, clapping, and shouting of "Debs, Debs, we want Debs!" For twenty-five minutes this wild scene lasted, broken only by the singing of the *Internationale,* the *Marseillaise,* the *Hymn to Free Russia,* and finally, the *Red Flag.* As the deep strains of *Maryland* rose from all corners of hall and gallery with a fervor religious in its defiance of the present evil system and political hypocrisy, the reporters of the big city papers bent over with eager question: "That's *Maryland—what* are they singing to it?" *"The Red Flag,"* said I with a quiet smile at their shocked faces—*"The Red Flag* itself." Half a dozen pencils scribbled down the terrible fact that the "rabid socialists sang *The Red Flag* to the tune of *Maryland!"*

Then followed the climax of the afternoon. Tucker, of Illinois, left wing prophet, led off a "snake-dance" round the hall in which all left and right wing delegates joined, even from ultra-respectable New York state, to the chant of "Debs! Debs! Eu-gene Debs!" Finally, the red streamers came forth from sundry corners of the hall and were waved aloft by certain "left" enthusiasts, while Koop, of Illinois, continued to parade à la snake-dance all by his lonesome and might have been rotating still had he not been gently led back to his seat by Bearak, of Massachusetts!

All this while a more than life-size portrait of Debs himself in his characteristic dramatic attitude of right arm extended in speech had been placed right at the front of the platform, and one did not need much

imagination to feel that the "gentleman from Indiana" was actually among us in person as well as in spirit.

When the chair finally obtained order Joseph Cannon, of New York, was called upon as seconder of the nomination. "Being in a Federal prison," he declared, "is no disgrace to Debs, but it is a disgrace that will drive the present administration into oblivion." Cannon told the story of Emerson's visit to Thoreau, imprisoned for refusing to pay his taxes in support of the Mexican War. To Emerson's question why Thoreau was in jail came the stinging reply, "Waldo, Waldo, *why are you not here?*" Asserting that Debs' incarceration had glorified the Federal prison, Cannon suggested the prison bars as the Socialist campaign emblem.

Irwin St. John Tucker, of Illinois, expressed the feelings of the left wing in support of Debs. "When Debs was imprisoned 13 months ago, Wilson was the highest of all men living. On him were centred all the hopes of a downtrodden and betrayed humanity. 'This Wilson,' they cried, 'is savior of the world!' But then came the thought 'This is the man who sent 'Gene Debs to jail.' Never was so great a fall in history as that of Wilson in these 13 months. The people still hear Wilson's words, but they see the prison walls—'he has sold his soul for power.' The eyes of men are turning from the White House to Atlanta Prison. We are not hero worshippers," said Tucker in conclusion, "we hail Debs not as leader, for the workers must emancipate themselves, but as our own embodiment. We are lovers of *those who are true.*"

Victor L. Berger, who actually converted Debs to Socialism, remarked that he was largely responsible for Debs' troubles as, but for his bringing him to the Socialist Party, Debs might not now be in Atlanta! Berger said they of Wisconsin were "short on phrases but long on action" and promised a big vote rolled up for Debs in his state.

James Oneal, of Terre Haute, Indiana, and the New York *Call,* member of the National Executive Committee, added his words of support to the nomination as an old friend of Debs. He drew an analogy from the fifties, when Abraham Lincoln "came out of the West" as antagonist of those who stood for "exploitation of men and women because of the color of their skins." Today in another grave social crisis there comes once more out of that great West a man "who grew up among the workers of the Wabash and Mississippi—who knew the problems of the worker because he was himself a workingman."

The final speech was delivered by Morris Hillquit, veteran fighter of the New York delegation. He believed a word was needed to explain to the outside world why Debs had been chosen for President. It was not because everybody loved 'Gene Debs—no one could help it who knew him—but because Eugene V. Debs was the very embodiment of the militant working-class spirit, the incarnation of the ideals of the Socialist Party, and of human liberty itself. "We nominate Eugene V. Debs as a challenge to all that stands for oppression, for imprisonment, imprisonment of the body, imprisonment of the spirit; to all that stands for exploitation of man by man. Our nomination means that we are determined not to recede one inch from our revolutionary stand because we have settled down to specific work in this country, because the time has come for the constructive part of our movement to be more emphasized."

Judge Panken's smiling question "Is there any further nomination?" was met by such a roar of applause and shouts of "We want Debs" that there could remain no scintilla of doubt as to the fierce unanimity of left and right alike upon their Presidential candidate.

The tide is rolling up. At the Labor Party Convention held last fall in Chicago the most striking demonstration of all was given at the incidental mention of Eugene Debs and his fellow political prisoners. On Thursday, in Boston, the same day Debs was unanimously nominated by the Socialist

Party Convention, the great gathering of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, the example par excellence of a modern trade union with a social purpose, endorsed Eugene V. Debs for President of the United States with "indescribable enthusiasm" and pledged support to the limit in the coming campaign.

"From the penitentiary to the White House"—the phrase of the Amalgamated in their telegram of greetings to the Socialist Party Convention—bids fair to become the slogan of the whole socialist working-class movement of America in these next few months.

The Socialist Convention

Harry W. Laidler

EUGENE VICTOR DEBS, in prison garb in Atlanta, was the inspiration, the keynote of the Socialist Party convention held in New York City, May 9-16, 1920. On Thursday afternoon, when Debs was nominated standard-bearer of the party of the 1920 campaign, the convention reached its high water mark of enthusiasm.[1]

The naming of Debs was the most striking event of the convention. It was not, however, the only important feature of the week.

To many of nearly equal interest, and containing more of the element of surprise, was the nomination of the vice-presidential candidate. James H. Maurer, president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, had been slated by many for that position. The veteran labor leader was asked to serve by right wing and left wing, but felt that his duties in Pennsylvania compelled his withdrawal from the race. Many delegates also went to the convention pledged to the candidacy of Kate Richards O'Hare, now serving a five years' sentence as a political prisoner in Jefferson City jail. The delegates remained loyal in spirit to Kate O'Hare, but one after another came to the conclusion that if Debs were in jail, one of the candidates should be free to speak for the party and for his imprisoned running mate.

With Maurer and O'Hare out of the running, the candidacy of Seymour Stedman of Chicago was urged, particularly after his masterful oration at the Madison Square Garden meeting of Sunday, the 9th. His personality, his years of service in socialist ranks, were dwelt upon. Stedman had begun his career as a newsboy in the streets of the great western city. He had studied law, had been admitted to the bar, and in the early nineties had thrown himself into the socialist movement, becoming a close friend of Eugene V. Debs during the railway strike of 1894. Later he had helped to found the Socialist Party, together with Debs, Hillquit, and Harriman, had served with distinction as socialist legislator in the Illinois legislature, and, during the war, had been the chief legal defender of socialists indicted under the espionage law. Here and in the Albany trial, his skill and eloquence, his wide knowledge of history and economics, and his legal training enhanced his already high reputation as an advocate of labor.

His name was placed in nomination by Lena Morrow Lewis of California. She described him as "a barefoot newspaper boy, as a loyal and faithful servant of the working class," as a lawyer whose keen insight had "baffled opponents and commanded the respect of bench and bar," and as a speaker who was able "to give the socialist message in terms understood by the working class."

R. H. Howe of Illinois, Algernon Lee of New York, and Oscar Ameringer of Wisconsin seconded the nomination, Ameringer making his usual whimsical address and declaring that generally he didn't favor lawyers, but that he felt that "no one but a lawyer can run on the socialist ticket at this time, criticize the 'new freedom,' and get away with it."

When the vote was called for Stedman received 106 to 26 for Kate O'Hare. Amid

[1] See article by W. Harris Crook on page 24.

much enthusiasm the nomination was thereupon made unanimous.

Significant Features

The convention was noted not only for its nominations. It was marked by a desire to rid the socialist movement of mere phrasemongering, to express socialist theory and tactics in terms that the average American could readily understand, to deal realistically with the concrete political and economic situation today, and to avoid narrow sectarianism. On the other hand, it refused time and again to compromise on essential principles of socialism, and to be driven to a retreat because of outside misrepresentation and persecution. One feature which most impressed observers—particularly those who had attended the emergency conventions of 1917 and 1919—was the spirit of comradeship and good will, despite most divergent opinions, which characterized its every session. Finally the delegates possessed to the full that most necessary ingredient of a successful movement, a saving sense of humor—a sense that never failed to come to the rescue in critical stages of convention proceedings.

To what extent the fine granite club house of the Finnish socialists, immaculately clean from top to bottom, with its great meeting hall, satisfying cafeteria, and other needed comforts, and situated in one of the choice parts of the city,[2] was responsible for this good will and humor it is impossible to say. But the fact is that these qualities were there and there in abundance.

Another encouraging feature to the socialist was the presence at the convention of fraternal delegates representing numerous advanced labor organizations. A distinct disappointment, on the other hand, was the small percentage of women delegates—scarcely a bakers' dozen. California was the one state in which the women in the delegation were in the majority, and this in the pioneer woman suffrage party of the United States.

Poll of Delegates

The convention proper formally opened with the singing of the Internationale and the Marseillaise on Saturday morning, May 8, at 10:30. The calling of the roll indicated the presence of some 160 delegates from about thirty states, the delegations from New York, Illinois, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania leading in the order named, and making up the bulk of the convention. Despite the charges of foreign control of the party, a census of the New York *Times* made later in the session indicated that of the 156 delegates listed, but four were non-citizens, three of these being Finns, while 96 were born in this country, 13 in Germany, 12 in Russia, and scattering numbers in other countries.[3]

[2] The location of the convention was the Finnish Socialist Hall, Fifth Avenue and 127th Street, New York City. The building was owned by the Finnish socialists. This was the first time a national Socialist Convention was held in a hall owned by the party.

[3] This investigation of the New York *Times* (May 13, 1920), showed the nationalities and occupations of the delegates listed as follows:

Birthplace

United States	96	Poland	2
Germany	13	Norway	1
Russia	12	Ireland	1
Finland	8	Holland	1
England	4	Canada	1
Sweden	3	Ukrainia	1
Italy	3	Bulgaria	1
Bohemia	3	Scotland	1
Austria	2	Switzerland	1
Hungary	2	Total	156

Of the 156 delegates there are four who are not citizens of the United States—two from Massachusetts, one from the state of Washington, and one from Wisconsin.

Occupations

Editors and journalists	18	Machinists and electrical workers	4
Cigarmakers	4	Engineers	4
Skilled workers (toolmakers, etc.)	17	Housekeepers	3
Laborers	13	Foremen and managers	3
Lawyers	12	Nurses	2
Printers and compositors	12	Butchers and bakers	2
Socialist workers (organizers)	11	Physicians and dentists	2
Educational workers teachers, speakers, etc.)	11	Waiters and waitresses	2
Public officials, judges, aldermen)	7	Agents and brokers.	2
Office workers	6	Painter	1
Bookkeepers	6	Rug Manufacturer..	1
Merchants	5	Farmer	1
Salesmen	5	Newsdealer	1
		State Chairman World War Veterans	1
		Total	156

Hillquit's Keynote Speech

The first order of business was the election of the chairman of the day. This gave to the left wingers led by the Illinois delegation an opportunity of estimating their strength. They nominated J. Louis Engdahl as their representative. The regulars named Morris Hillquit of New York. Hillquit, who appeared for the first time in more than two years at a party gathering, was elected by a vote of 91 to 29 and was given an enthusiastic ovation. He delivered the "keynote speech" on assuming the gavel, in part as follows:

"Within the last year the powers of darkness and reaction in the country have united in a concerted attack upon the socialist movement unparalleled in ferociousness and lawlessness.

"The obvious object of the provocative onslaught is to crush the spirit and paralyze the struggles of the socialist movement or to goad it into a policy of desperation and lawlessness, thus furnishing its opponents the pretext for wholesale violent reprisals and physical extermination.

"The great question before this convention is, Will the socialists of America prove true enough and brave enough to survive the attack and to withstand the provocation? We will!

"In Europe, where the ruling classes are wiser than ours, one nation after another is surrendering to the overwhelming tide of the socialist movement. The great working-class republic of Russia has survived all counter-revolutionary attacks, domestic and foreign, and now, after a continuous and embittered struggle of 30 months, it stands before the world more strongly intrenched, more hopeful and confident than ever.

"In Sweden, in Czecho-Slovakia, in Germany, and Austria socialists largely are in control of the government.

"In England, Italy, France, and Scandinavia the socialist workers are fast gaining political power. The most enlightened nations have openly or tacitly recognized that socialism alone has the moral and intellectual resources to rebuild and revivify the shattered world, and in this, as in all other vital currents of modern life, the United States cannot effectively or permanently seclude itself from the rest of the world.

"Nor do we, American socialists, depend for our hope of success solely upon the precedent and example of Europe. The conditions in our own country and the record of our own party are the gauge of our ultimate victory here.

"We have nothing to retract, nothing to apologize for, in connection with our stand in recent years.

"When Congress committed the United States to participation in the world war, ours was the only organized political voice in the country to protest. We declared that the inhuman slaughter in Europe was born in a sanguinary clash of commercial interests and imperialistic ambitions.

"We warned our countrymen that the savage contest of arms would bring no peace, no liberty, and no happiness to the world, but that it would result in misery and desolation. Now the whole world is beginning to see the justice of our criticism and the tragic fulfilment of our prediction.

"One year and a half after the formal cessation of hostilities, there is no peace in Europe; the victorious Powers are intriguing among themselves about land grabs and national advantages, while Europe is starved and the ghastly wounds inflicted by the war upon the whole system of human civilization remain open and bleeding.

"Today it is becoming increasingly clearer that if the 'treaty of peace' is not written all over, the war will have to be fought all over—unless the world-wide triumph of socialism overtakes both the treaty and war.

"If there remain any large sections of workers who put their naive faith in old-party messiahs, Woodrow Wilson must have effectively destroyed their faith. For be it remembered that in 1916, Woodrow Wilson ran as a 'radical.' He promised practically socialism through the short cut of the Democratic Party.

"One-half of the normal supporters of the Socialist Party ticket cast their votes for him. Woodrow Wilson was elected over Charles E. Hughes by the vote of socialists. In California alone the defection in the normal socialist vote determined his victory in the presidential contest. Mr. Wilson's administration in the last three years has furnished the most striking and abhorrent proof of the fallacy of the 'good man' theory in politics.

"Wilson, the pacifist, drew us into the world's most frightful war.

According to the New York *Times* list (May 12, 1920), the following states were represented:

New England: Connecticut (4), Massachusetts (12), New Hampshire (2), Rhode Island (1).

Middle Atlantic States: Delaware (1), Maryland (3), New Jersey (7), New York (27), Pennsylvania (14).

West: Arkansas (1), Colorado (1), Illinois (19), Indiana (6), Iowa (2), Kansas (2), Michigan (5), Minnesota (6), Missouri (4), Ohio (8), Oklahoma (5), Utah (1), Wisconsin (18).

Pacific Coast: California (5), Oregon (1), Washington (1).

South: District of Columbia (1), Georgia (1), Kentucky (1), Tennessee (1), Texas (1), West Virginia (1).

There were also fraternal delegates from a number of organizations.

"Wilson, the anti-militarist, imposed conscription upon the country in war, and urged a large standing army and a huge navy in peace.

"Wilson, the democrat, arrogated to himself autocratic powers grossly inconsistent with a republican form of government.

"Wilson, the liberal, revived the mediæval institutions of the inquisition of speech, thought, and conscience. His administration suppressed or tried to suppress radical publications, raided houses and meeting places of its political opponents, destroyed their property, and assaulted their persons.

"Wilson, the apostle of the 'new freedom,' infested the country with stool pigeons, spies, and agents provocateurs, and filled the jails with political prisoners.

"Wilson, the champion of labor, restored involuntary servitude in the mines and on the railroads.

"Wilson, the idealist and humanitarian, has inaugurated a reign of intellectual obscurantism, moral terrorism, and political reaction the like of which this country has never known before.

"The morbid national psychology which he has helped to create has produced such atavistic political types as Palmer, Burleson, Sweet, and Lusk. It has advanced to places of honor, political mountebanks like Ole Hanson, but has put into prison stripes the noblest and truest types of American manhood, persons like Eugene Victor Debs.

"Woodrow Wilson was probably inspired by the best of intentions when he ran for reelection. But he did not express the sentiments, convictions, or interests of the class he represented or the political party to which he owed allegiance.

"When the great crisis came and he was forced to choose between the class and the party to whom he belonged and the workers for whom he professed a platonic affection, he rallied to his class and party interests.

"Nor was Wilson's fall purely personal. When Woodrow Wilson fell, the entire structure of middle-class and capitalist liberalism tumbled with him like a house of cards.

"Today there is not throughout the length and breadth of the United States a single radical or even progressive political group of any importance outside of the organized socialist movement.

"The attempts of some advanced organized workers to form an independent political party of labor on a national scale has so far foundered upon the rock of conservatism and narrowness of the American Federation leadership, and the efforts to create a progressive middle-class party have met with little response.

"The only active and organized force in American politics that combats reaction and oppression, that stands for the large masses of the workers, and for a social order of justice and industrial equality is the Socialist Party."

Following the chairman's address and the reading of the report of the Executive Committee—a report which showed a membership of 40,000 dues-paying members—the convention prepared for a long-drawn-out battle over three important documents—the declaration of principles, the party platform, and the report on international relations.

The Fight Over Socialist Principles

At the September convention the Executive Committee was authorized to appoint a committee to draft a declaration of principles. The committee appointed, Morris Hillquit, chairman, prepared the draft and presented it to the convention.[4] The left wing group, on the other hand, had copied in essence the declaration drafted by Algernon Lee and adopted September last as the preamble to the constitution of the party.

In addition to this preamble, however, the group inserted two clauses. Section eight, one of the added clauses, introduced the idea of proletarian dictatorship as follows:

"In the final struggle of the workers for political supremacy, in order to facilitate the overthrow of the capitalist system, *all power during the transitional period must be in the hands of the workers,* in order to insure the success of the revolution."

Section nine urged that the workers "begin now to train themselves in the problems incident to the control and management of industry," while section ten advocated the change of our class society "into a society controlled by all engaged in some form of useful work, through representative bodies chosen by occupational groups."[5]

The proponents of the last-named program first attempted to secure the election of another committee to draw up a declaration to be submitted to the convention, a move, however, which was defeated by a two-thirds

[4] This draft as amended appears on page 36.
[5] See draft on page 41.

vote.[6] On Monday the left wing proposed their program as a basis for discussion. After prolonged debate this proposal was also rejected by a vote of 103 to 33, and the convention began the discussion of socialist principles on the basis of the Hillquit draft.

In opening the debate J. Louis Engdahl contended that the official draft could be adopted by the Nonpartisan League, or if slightly amended to a more radical form, could be accepted by the "so-called Labor Party." His substitute would include principles of international socialism as well as purely American socialism. "We cannot compete with the Labor Party in phrases," he asserted, "but we can compete with all in revolutionary working-class principles."

Hillquit replied that he had no objection in principle to the substitute, but felt that it had been given its proper place as a preamble of the party constitution.

"The official draft was written for *outsiders* who ask, 'What is this socialism? What are your methods?' " contended Hillquit. "It was something to put into the hands of such men. War is over and the period of rebuilding has come, not only for the world but also for the Socialist Party. We must discard phrases and talk sense for a while. I have avoided Marxian terminology, because it means nothing to the ordinary worker. The draft is but 1,800 words. It is not a slogan but a reasoned explanation of a world philosophy strange and new to the majority of the people. Clause 8 of the substitute draft is the only original part of that document that is a thinly veiled advocacy of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat,' which is not a socialist doctrine, nor is it applicable to present-day America. If the Labor Party would accept the principles framed in the official draft, so much the better. All we have ever worked for is to get our message over to the workers of America."

William F. Kruse, for the minority draft, specifically criticized the committee's report on the ground that it made no mention of the Labor Party.

Irwin Tucker defended section eight of the Engdahl substitute, stating that the giving of all power to the workers during the transitional period was necessary to safeguard society from counter-revolution. He declared against violence, as violence would merely lead to the spilling of the blood of the workers.

Victor Berger of Wisconsin complained that the socialists in the past—Wisconsin socialists excepted—spoke in a language that the people of America did not understand, and that there was never a time in history when the American Socialist Party had such an opportunity as it had today.

"Gompers, Gary, the Steel Trust, all have the proletariat—all control them—except ourselves. The only places where the socialists have gripped the workers are in Milwaukee and in the East Side of New York.

"I don't want any dictatorship," Berger concluded. "I want democracy. If I cannot convince a crowd of the correctness of my principles, I have no right to win out."

Declaring that for the first time in the history of this country there was a mass drift toward socialism, Soltis of Minnesota, a proponent of the official draft, asked: "Shall we use our great opportunity in this campaign to unload Marxian phrases or to preach socialism in terms of the life of the working class?"

Joseph E. Cohen of Philadelphia dealt briefly with the difference between conditions in this country and in Russia, asserting that the same impulse that led to the revolution in Russia gave in America an impetus to women suffrage and to independent political action on the part of the workers.

Holland of Illinois insisted that the substitute principles spoke in terms of American life, and that it was necessary to read over the official draft several times before it was

[6] The left wing claimed that the declaration of principles should have been submitted to the party sixty days prior to the convention. James Oneal admitted that this would have been the proper procedure, but that the committee was so overwhelmed with the Albany trial and other fights that it was impossible to attend to this matter more speedily.

understood thoroughly. "Why are the rank and file of the workers not flocking to the Socialist Party?" he asked. "Because they do not want to have a domination similar to the brand of socialism in charge of the German situation."

Summing up for the majority, James Oneal declared that it was too early to know conclusively the arguments for and against proletarian dictatorship, that by next year a serious literature would have been published on this subject. The time and conditions that favored the Russian revolution must be studied and compared with those in this country before making any attempt to adopt Russian methods here.

"I do stand for the upheaval in Russia," he continued, "but that doesn't mean that we should adopt the same policies. Are we scientific socialists or dogmatic emotionalists?

"Two can play at the game of dictatorship. If you tell your enemy that, when in power, you are going to disfranchise him, he will decide that he is now in power, and will do what he can to keep it. You will cease to be a political party and be driven underground.

"Bourgeois democracy, with all its shams and illusions, permits in normal times civilized methods of debate, and so long as we can use political power it is a shame for us to employ other means."

After the adoption of the official draft as a basis for discussion, debate waxed hot over specific portions of the declaration. Benjamin Glassberg of New York asked why socialists should declare that they seek to attain their goal "by orderly and constitutional methods," when the United States Supreme Court pronounces child labor laws unconstitutional and when socialists elected to office are expelled, as in Albany. "You are attempting to tie the hands of the workers, to put chains around them," he urged.

Charles Solomon replied that, even granting the inevitability of civil war, civil war was not the objective of the Socialist Party. "We will do our best," he concluded, "to bring about the cooperative republic with a minimum of industrial disorder."

"It is true that they fired Victor Berger from Congress," asserted Oscar Ameringer, in answer to Glassberg. "They kicked him out and we reelected him by a plurality of 5,000. They kicked him out again, and we reelected him by a majority of 5,000 against a combination of both Republican and Democratic parties. If they fire him out again, and again, we will elect him governor of Wisconsin, and in a few years will capture the first state in the union for the Socialist Party. We are now in a majority in Milwaukee County. A socialist is sheriff. He is a good sheriff. Do you want us to start a dictatorship of the proletariat?"

Interference with Labor Unions

The proposed elimination of the statement that the "Socialist Party does not interfere in the internal affairs of labor unions" caused another burst of oratory. Delegate Willert contended that labor organizations knew best how to organize themselves; that the way to win the unions was to stand with them in economic struggles, and that an attack on Gompers gave him but one more weapon which he might use to prejudice the rank and file.

Barney Berlyn of Illinois, the oldest delegate of the convention, recalled the harm done to the socialist movement by the organization of Socialist Trades and Labor Alliances by the S. L. P. in the nineties. He predicted that the recent succession of "gatling guns on paper, known as injunctions," hurled against the unions would make trade unionists increasingly radical.

Jasper McLevy of Connecticut accused some of the leaders of so-called revolutionary unions of trying to destroy the Socialist Party in Bridgeport, and predicted that intelligent socialist propaganda inside of the trade unions would develop a spirit among trade unionists that would soon force the Socialist Party to ever more radical positions.

Bauer of New Jersey told of increasing radicalism among the trade unionists he ap-

proached. "We are running away from the working class," he concluded, "when we repudiate the A. F. of L."

The section was kept in the declaration. The convention again went on record in favor of industrial unionism.

The Hillquit draft with slight modifications was thereupon adopted by a nearly three-fourths vote. The minority then proceeded to obtain signatures for a referendum vote on the two drafts.

The Platform[1]

The contest over the platform was of shorter duration. No sooner had the special committee presented its draft than Irwin Tucker moved that a substitute of the Illinois group be used as a basis of discussion. The insurgent group, however, though supported by a number who felt that the majority platform lacked "ring" and conciseness, were again defeated, this time by a vote of 80 to 60. The committee draft thereupon went through with few amendments.

The chief contest centered around the question of occupational representation. The left wing group desired to place the party on record again in favor of representation according to occupation as contrasted with representation according to territorial units. In urging a compromise resolution, Hillquit contended that people had common functions to perform by reason of their neighborhood relationship—educational, health, and other functions—as well as by reason of their interests as producers. A resolution was thereupon passed, which favored occupational as well as territorial representation, and also representation based on service. The clauses relating to loans to foreign governments and to the nationalization of banks led to repeated tilts, but were finally passed as proposed. R. H. Howe opposed the socialization of banks, on the ground that the government would have to take over the liabilities of banks as well as their assets. He also urged that the savings in the post office banks should be employed in loans to public bodies, and should not be deposited in private banks for private profit.

The Moscow International

From many viewpoints the most important debate of the convention occurred over the report on international relations, which treated primarily of the relation of the party to the Third or Moscow International. At the September, 1919, convention, the delegates had favored the majority report. This report condemned the Second International as "retrograde and failing to act in the interests of the working class," and urged "the speediest possible convocation of an international socialist congress" and the reconstitution of the socialist international among those elements adhering "by word and deed to the principle of the class struggle." It failed, however, to affiliate the party with Moscow.

The minority report of Engdahl, defeated at the convention, advocated that the Socialist Party support the Third International, "not so much because it supports the 'Moscow' program and methods, but because: (a) 'Moscow' is doing something which is really challenging world imperialism; (b) 'Moscow' is threatened by the combined capitalist forces of the world simply because it is proletarian; (c) under these circumstances, whatever we may have to say to 'Moscow' afterwards, it is the duty of socialists to stand by it now because its fall will mean the fall of socialist republics in Europe, and also the disappearance of socialist hopes for many years to come."

The majority and minority reports were submitted to a membership in a referendum vote, the minority winning out by 3,475 to 1,444, but a small percentage of the membership having expressed their sentiment one way or the other.

At the May convention three reports were submitted—a minority report of Victor L. Berger, urging that the Socialist Party withdraw from the Third International; a minority report signed by J. Louis Engdahl and William F. Quick declaring merely "The

[1] The entire platform as passed is contained on page 38 of this issue.

Socialist Party of the United States of America reaffirms its affiliation with the Third International," and the majority report, signed by six out of the nine members of the Committee reaffirming the party's affiliation with Moscow, insisting the while that "no formula such as 'the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of soviets' or any other special formula for the attainment of the socialist commonwealth be imposed or exacted as condition of affiliation with the Third International," and that the Socialist Party of the United States "participate in the movements looking to the union of all true socialist forces in the world into one International, and initiate and further such movements whenever the opportunity is presented."

Victor Berger, whose resolution obtained but a handful of votes, contended in support of his report that the Moscow International was not an International at all, but only a "nucleus" for an International. He asserted that a wide gulf existed between communists and socialists. "Socialism," he declared, "will always be opposed to the complete elimination of democracy—to the disfranchisement of all non-communist elements—to the dictatorship of the Communist Party. A genuine International must contain the Socialist Parties of England, Germany, France, Holland, Belgium, and the Scandinavian countries, and we should join them. Of course, I do not have in view the social patriots, but the parties that stood steadfastly during the war and ever since for the old established principles of our movement." Though listened to sympathetically after the first outburst from the galleries, and applauded for voicing there a distinctly unpopular side, Berger gained few adherents to his point of view.

The second minority report was introduced by Engdahl. Engdahl believed that affiliation should be reaffirmed without reservations. The Socialist Party should go on no fishing expeditions to form new internationals while a member of the Third International. While the French socialists, the British I. L. P., and the German Independent socialists had not as yet joined the Third International, there was a tremendous pressure from within urging that action.

The speaker declared that he did not think that the question of proletarian dictatorship entered into the matter. Nor were the leaders of the Third International anti-political. "The Italian Socialist Party now affiliated has sent 160 representatives to Parliament and only the other day," he declared, "the party swept the Nitti government out of power. It may be said that we should not affiliate with the Third International because it is dominated by Russia. But it was really started at Zimmerwald and Kienthal, and only after a couple of years was it controlled by the Russians."

Morris Hillquit, in presenting the report of the committee, analyzed the status of the Second and Third Internationals. The Second International is composed of social patriots. It is disrupted. The Third International presents but a nucleus.

Hillquit said that the German Independents, the French socialists, and the British Independent Labor Party, bent on forming a genuine International, and non-members of the Third International, were similar in character to the Socialist Party of America. A clear line, he felt, should be drawn between the relation of the party to the Moscow International and to Russia. The republic of Russia, no matter how it styles itself, is the government of the working class of Russia, striving to abolish every remnant of capitalism, hunted, persecuted, attacked by every imperial power, and we must uphold it.

"This does not mean that we must accept every dogma sent from Soviet Russia as a papal decree, nor that we adopt the specific institutions and forms into which this struggle is molded by special historical conditions."

The speaker then read excerpts from an appeal of the Executive Committee of the Third International, which welcomed anarcho-syndicalist groups to the International, declaring that the unifying program of those who joined was the "dictatorship of the proletariat on the basis of the soviet." He felt

that if this document were the last word on the subject the party in this country could not remain within the group.

"I believe, however, that cooler heads in the Communist International would probably repudiate that position if it came to a vote. As a concrete proposition the statement regarding proletarian dictatorship is meaningless and misleading, and, so far as conditions here are concerned, anti-socialist and anti-revolutionary.

"The term dictatorship of the proletariat was first used by Karl Marx in 1875 in his criticism of the Gotha program. He declared at that time that there would be a transitional period between the capitalist and socialist societies in which the state could be nothing else than a dictatorship of the proletariat. He stated that the party did not at that time have to occupy itself with this transitional stage.

"Marx did nothing to elaborate on this statement. The rule of which he spoke might have been any kind of transitory rule, parliamentary or otherwise. Marx used the term dictator in a somewhat wrong sense. Sometime later when Engels came to discuss this phrase, he declared that it was only necessary to look at the Paris Commune and there one would find a proletarian dictatorship. But the Paris Commune was a body elected on the basis of universal suffrage, which did not exclude any class from voting, and which contained socialists of all stripes.

"With all kindness toward Russia, there is there today neither a dictatorship nor a proletarian rule. A dictatorship is an irresponsible rule and the government of Russia is a perfectly responsible government. Lenin and Trotzky are not dictators. Russia is now a somewhat limited democracy, excluding from its ranks non-producing classes. Nor is it the rule of the proletariat, a rule of industrial workers not possessed of instruments of production. The Russian peasants are in the overwhelming majority. If it were a proletarian dictatorship there is no reason why in the United States we should adopt this shibboleth.

"Dictatorship of the proletariat, as used in recent literature, implies the disarming, the disfranchisement, the outlawing of the bourgeoisie. In a country of parliamentary traditions, I do not know that this is necessary. If we say that we want to take advantage of the ballot box, but when we become victorious that we will disfranchise and outlaw you, our opponents will say, but today we are victorious, and we will disfranchise you and outlaw you. This will resolve the battle into a physical fight.

"We must take our stand on one side or on the other. We can't stand on both sides. If we stand for dictatorship, we must take our medicine. The question then becomes one of armed revolt and the acquisition of power that way. Marxian socialism never stood for that method. We cannot join the International if that is made a condition.

"The Third International represents the best spirit in the movement. But we should insist that it be not an International merely of Eastern and Asiatic socialism. It should permit the right of self-determination in the matter of policies so long as no vital principle is violated. A true International can never be brought about so long as the Independent Socialists of Germany, the socialists of France, and the British Independent Labor Party stand outside."

Following a vigorous debate in which Engdahl declared that his motion did not necessarily carry with it the idea of proletarian dictatorship, and Hillquit asked why, if that were so, did he object to the insertion of the reservation, the vote was taken, and the Hillquit report won by a vote of 90 to 40. Here again the minority announced that it would demand a referendum vote on these two reports. Hillquit was then elected international secretary by a vote of 55 to 22 over Alexander Trachtenberg; and Algernon Lee of New York, James Oneal of New York, and Joseph E. Cohen of Pennsylvania, international delegates. A mission of three members to carry fraternal greetings to Russia was provided for, and the international delegates were instructed to begin negotiations for the creation of a Socialist Pan-American Congress.

Party Resolutions

After the discussion of these three most vital questions—the declaration of principles, the party platform, and the question of affiliation with the Third International—the delegates rushed through many resolutions and reports in rapid succession. Special propaganda was proposed among women, and at least one organizer, a colored woman working especially among colored women, was to be placed in the field, as well as two or more colored men. A national lyceum course was recommended. Moving pictures as a means of education were to be studied. The national Executive Committee was authorized to organize a publishing society. Occupational

groups supplementary to territorial groups and council were urged within the party.

More than a score of resolutions were passed. Socialists were urged to assist the cooperative movement "as a means whereby workers may control the distribution of the necessities of life." The legislatures of Connecticut, Delaware, and Louisiana were appealed to to grant suffrage to women. Militarism was condemned. Adequate provision was demanded for the registration of votes cast by migratory voters, and expressions of sympathy were sent to those struggling for democracy in Ireland, India, and Hungary. The refusal of the state department to admit Jean Longuet of France was denounced as a part of a program "to prevent intercourse with the labor and socialist forces of all countries." The Plumb plan was approved in its essential outlines. Justice was demanded for post office employes. Anti-syndicalist legislation was attacked as an effort to suppress legitimate labor activities. The educational work of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society was commended and socialists were urged to give whatever cooperation they could to the socialist dailies, to the Federated Press, and to *The Socialist Review*. The custom of inviting fraternal delegates to the convention—many of them had presented meaty reports to the gathering—was also commended.

Federations and Y. P. S. L.

The convention endorsed a report on the important question of the relation of the language federations to the party which urged the establishment of a "closer relationship between the party and the federations," and a stronger party control over the activities of the federations, but which gave to the federations about the same status as they formerly held.

The relation between the party and the young people organized in the "Y. P. S. L." —the Young People's Socialist League— caused many moments of heated discussion, the convention finally deciding to make this group, which had been torn asunder by the party split, an integral part of the party again. The constitution was also amended without opposition, providing that all delegates to international, national, and other conventions and all executive officers must be citizens of the United States. Membership in the party was open to all residents of the United States of 21 years or over.

A short, animated discussion arose over the resolution condemning prohibition. The resolution was tabled.

One woman, Bertha Mailly, executive secretary of the Rand School, was elected to the new National Executive Committee of seven members. James Oneal of New York, E. T. Melms of Wisconsin, Edward Henry of Indiana, W. M. Brandt of Missouri, J. Hagel of Oklahoma, and George E. Roewer, Jr., of Massachusetts—all on the former National Executive—were reelected to that committee after the convention expressed its appreciation of their work.

Socialist Unity

Before adjournment one further resolution brought forth sharp differences of opinion—the resolution on socialist unity. The resolution brought before the convention declared (1) "That any individual, branch, local or state, or language federation that left the party last fall because of tactical differences and now desires to reenter on the Socialist Party platform and constitution be welcome to return; (2) that where Socialist Party locals and other groups of the labor movement exist side by side in the same locality, we propose the creation of joint campaign committees for the management of a working-class electoral campaign upon the basis of our platform; (3) that after the campaign is over, steps be taken to confer with representatives of other factions of the movement with a view to establishing possible basis for organization unity; (4) that a national advisory council of all working-class organizations for the purpose of combating the reactionary forces be formed so that wherever possible there be voluntary united action by all political and economic organizations who take their stand on the basis of the class struggle."

To the foregoing provisions little objection was raised. Section 1, however, added "that dues stamps or other evidences of membership in the groups formed by the split in the party be recognized as evidence of good standing during the time involved."

Delegate Block of New York moved the elimination of this clause. If this declaration went through, he contended, every utterance of the elements who left the party would be attributed to socialists. "We would be held responsible for them. I believe that we should welcome back all good socialists and that many who left are good socialists, but we should not be creating further trouble for ourselves."

William Kruse, defending this clause, said that if we eliminated it, we would be but giving lip service to the idea of unity. "If 'Gene Debs can recognize these comrades as good comrades, we can." Feeley of California and Cook of New York thought the clause poor tactics and it was stricken out.

Assemblyman Orr objected to clause three on the ground that unity conferences were futile. Kruse again maintained that the delegates should favor this section out of consideration for Debs if for no other reason. "We must go to the left and we must go to the right to find whether cooperation is possible on the basis of socialist principles and platform," he concluded. The remainder of the report passed as read. During the final hours of the convention a motion favoring cooperation with "other political groups" whose views are "in accord with" those contained in the Socialist Party platform—a proposal for cooperation with the labor party—was tabled without discussion.

The Finale

On Friday night the curtain was drawn on the Socialist Party convention in New York —the most significant and important gathering—if we may judge from the flood of newspaper publicity received—in the history of the movement in this country. The next appearance of the delegates was in the grounds of the White House, Washington, pleading for amnesty for their standard-bearer and for other war prisoners now serving in the prisons of this country. An interview with Tumulty, a few words with Attorney-General Palmer and other officials, a mass meeting in Washington—a small echo of the tremendous gathering of the Sunday before in Madison Square Garden, New York—and the delegates scattered each to his section to prepare for what promises to be the greatest presidential campaign ever waged by the forces of industrial democracy in the United States.

Declaration of Principles

Section 1. The Socialist Party of the United States demands that the country and its wealth be redeemed from the control of private interests and turned over to the people to be administered for the equal benefit of all.

Section 2. America is not owned by the American people. Our so-called national wealth is not the wealth of the nation but of the privileged few.

These are the ruling class of America. They are small in numbers, but they dominate the lives and shape the destinies of their fellow men.

They own the people's jobs and determine their wages; they control the markets of the world and fix the prices of the farmers' product; they own their homes and fix their rents; they own their food and set its cost; they own their press and formulate their convictions; they own the government and make their laws; they own their schools and mould their minds.

Section 3. Around and about the capitalist class cluster the numerous and varied groups of the population, generally designated as the "middle classes." They consist of farm owners, small merchants and manufacturers, professionals and better paid employes. Their economic status is often precarious. They live in hopes of being lifted into the charmed spheres of the ruling classes. Their social psychology is that of retainers of the wealthy. As a rule they sell their gifts, knowledge, and efforts to the capitalist interests. They are staunch upholders of the existing order of social inequalities.

Section 4. The bulk of the American people is composed of workers. Workers on the farm and in the factory, in mines and mills, on ships and railroads, in offices and counting houses, in schools and in personal service, workers of hand and brain, all men and women who render useful

service to the community in the countless ramified ways of modern civilization. They have made America what it is. They sustain America from day to day. They bear most of the burdens of life and enjoy but few of its pleasures. They create the enormous wealth of the country but live in constant dread of poverty. They feed and clothe the rich, and yet bow to their alleged superiority. They keep alive the industries but have no say in their management. They constitute the majority of the people but have no control of the government. Despite the forms of political equality, the workers of the United States are virtually a subject class.

Section 5. The Socialist Party is the party of the workers. It espouses their cause because in the workers lies the hope of the political, economic, and social redemption of the country. The ruling class and their retainers cannot be expected to change the iniquitous system of which they are the beneficiaries. Individual members of these classes often join in the struggle against the capitalist order from motives of personal idealism, but whole classes have never been known to abdicate their rule and surrender their privileges for the mere sake of social justice. The workers alone have a direct and compelling interest in abolishing the present profit system.

The Socialist Party desires the workers of America to take the economic and political power from the capitalist class, not that they may establish themselves as a new ruling class, but in order that all class divisions be abolished forever.

Section 6. To perform this supreme social task the workers must be organized as a political party of their own. They must realize that both the Republican and Democratic parties are the political instruments of the master classes, and equally pledged to uphold and perpetuate capitalism. They must be trained to use the ballot box to vote out the tools of the capitalist and middle classes and to vote in representatives of the workers. A true political party of labor must be founded upon the uncompromising demand for the complete socialization of the industries. That means doing away with the private ownership of the sources and instruments of wealth, production, and distribution, abolishing workless incomes in the form of profits, interest, or rents, transforming the whole able-bodied population of the country into useful workers, and securing to all workers the full social value of their work.

Section 7. The Socialist Party is such a political party. It strives by means of political methods, including the action of its representatives in the legislatures and other public offices to force the enactment of such measures as will immediately benefit the workers, raise their standard of life, increase their power, and stiffen their resistance to capitalist aggression. Its purpose is to secure a majority in Congress and in every state legislature, to win the principal executive and judicial offices, to become the dominant and controlling party, and, when in power, to transfer the industries to ownership by the people, beginning with those of a public character, such as banking, insurance, mining, transportation and communication, as well as the trustified industries, and extending the process to all other industries susceptible of collective ownership, as rapidly as their technical conditions will permit.

It also proposes to socialize the system of public education and health and all activities and institutions vitally affecting the public needs and welfare, including dwelling houses.

The Socialist program advocates the socialization of all large farming estates and land used for industrial and public purposes, as well as all instrumentalities for storing, preserving, and marketing farm products. It does not contemplate interference with the private possession of land actually used and cultivated by occupants.

The Socialist Party, when in political control, proposes to reorganize the government in form and substance so as to change it from a tool of repression into an instrument of social and industrial service.

Section 8. The Socialist transformation cannot be successfully accomplished by political victories alone. The reorganization of the industries upon the basis of social operation and cooperative effort will require an intelligent and disciplined working class, skilled not only in the processes of physical work, but also in the technical problems of management. This indispensable training the workers can best gain as a result of their constant efforts to secure a greater share in the management of industries through their labor unions and cooperatives. These economic organizations of labor have also an immediate practical and vital function. Their daily struggles for betterment in the sphere of their respective industries supplement and reinforce the political efforts of the Socialist Party in the same general direction, and their great economic power may prove a formidable weapon for safeguarding the political rights of labor.

The Socialist party does not intend to interfere in the internal affairs of labor unions, but will always support the workers in all their economic struggles. In order, however, that such struggles may attain the maximum of efficiency and success, the Socialists favor the organization of workers along the lines of industrial unionism in the closest coöperation as one organized working-class army.

Section 9. The Socialist Party does not seek to interfere with the institution of the family as such, but promises to make family life fuller, nobler, and happier by removing the sordid factor of economic dependence of woman on man, and by assuring to all members of the family greater material security, and more leisure to cultivate the joys of the home.

The Socialist Party adheres strictly to the principle of complete separation of state and church. It recognizes the right of voluntary communities of citizens to maintain religious institutions and to worship freely according to the dictates of their conscience.

The Socialist Party seeks to attain its end by orderly and constitutional methods, so long as the ballot box, the right of representation, and civil liberties are maintained. Violence is not the weapon of the Socialist Party but of the short-sighted representatives of the ruling classes, who stupidly believe that social movements and ideals can be destroyed by brutal physical repression. The Socialists depend upon education and organization of the masses.

Section 10. The domination of the privileged classes has been so strong that they have succeeded in persuading their credulous fellow-citizens that they, the despoilers of America, are the only true Americans; that their selfish class interests are the sacred interests of the nation; that only those that submit supinely to their oppressive rule are loyal and patriotic citizens, and that all those who oppose their exactions and pretensions are traitors to their country.

The Socialists emphatically reject this fraudulent notion of patriotism.

The Socialist Party gives its service and allegiance to the masses of American people, the working classes, but this interest is not limited to America alone. In modern civilization the destinies of all nations are inextricably interwoven. No nation can be prosperous and happy while its neighbors are poor and miserable. No nation can be truly free if other nations are enslaved. The ties of international interdependence and solidarity are particularly vital among the working classes. In all advanced countries of the world the working classes are engaged in the identical struggle for political and economic freedom, and the success or failure of each is immediately reflected upon the progress and fortunes of all.

Section 11. The Socialist Party is opposed to militarism and to wars among nations. Modern wars are generally caused by commercial and financial rivalries and intrigues of the capitalist interests in different countries. They are made by the ruling classes and fought by the masses. They bring wealth and power to the privileged few and suffering, death, and desolation to the many. They cripple the struggles of the workers for political rights, material improvement, and social justice, and tend to sever the bonds of solidarity between them and their brothers in other countries.

Section 12. The Socialist movement is a world struggle in behalf of human civilization. The Socialist Party of the United States coöperates with similar parties in other countries, and extends to them its full support in their struggles, confident that the class-conscious workers all over the world will eventually secure the powers of government in their respective countries, abolish the oppression and chaos, the strife and bloodshed of international capitalism, and establish a federation of Socialist republics, coöperating with each other for the benefit of the human race and for the maintenance of the peace of the world.

The Socialist Party Platform

In the national campaign of 1920 the Socialist Party calls upon all American workers of hand and brain, and upon all citizens who believe in political liberty and social justice, to free the country from the oppressive misrule of the old political parties, and to take the Government into their own hands under the banner and upon the program of the Socialist Party.

The outgoing Administration, like Democratic and Republican Administrations of the past, leaves behind it a disgraceful record of solemn pledges unscrupulously broken and public confidence ruthlessly betrayed.

It obtained the suffrage of the people on a platform of peace, liberalism, and social betterment, but drew the country into a devastating war, and inaugurated a regime of despotism, reaction, and oppression unsurpassed in the annals of the Republic.

It promised to the American people a treaty which would assure to the world a reign of international right and true democracy. It gave its sanction and support to an infamous pact formulated behind closed doors by predatory elder statesmen of European and Asiatic Imperialism. Under this pact territories have been annexed against the will of their populations, land cut off from their sources of sustenance, and nations seeking their freedom in the exercise of the much heralded right of self-determination have been brutally fought with armed force, intrigue, and starvation blockades.

To the millions of young men, who staked their lives on the field of battle, to the people of the

country who gave unstintingly of their toil and property to support the war, the Democratic Administration held out the sublime ideal of a union of the peoples of the world organized to maintain perpetual peace among nations on the basis of justice and freedom. It helped create a reactionary alliance of imperialistic governments, banded together to bully weak nations, crush working-class governments and perpetuate strife and warfare.

While thus furthering the ends of reaction, violence and oppression abroad our administration suppressed the cherished and fundamental rights and civil liberties at home.

Upon the pretext of wartime necessity the Chief Executive of the Republic and the appointed heads of his administration were clothed with dictatorial powers, and Congress enacted laws in open and direct violation of the constitutional safeguards of freedom of expression.

Hundreds of citizens who raised their voices for the maintenance of political and industrial rights during the war were indicted under the espionage law, tried in an atmosphere of prejudice and hysteria, and many of them are now serving inhumanly long jail sentences for daring to uphold the traditions of liberty which once were sacred in this country.

Agents of the Federal Government unlawfully raided homes and meeting places and prevented or broke up peaceable gatherings of citizens.

The Postmaster General established a censorship of the press more autocratic than that ever tolerated in a regime of absolutism, and has harassed and destroyed publications on account of their political and economic views, by excluding them from the mails.

And after the war was in fact long over the Administration has not scrupled to continue a policy of repression and terrorism under the shallow and hypocritical guise of wartime measures.

It has practically imposed involuntary servitude and peonage on a large class of American workers by denying them the right to quit work and coercing them into acceptance of inadequate wages and onerous conditions of labor. It has dealt a foul blow to the traditional American right of asylum by deporting hundreds of foreign-born workers, by administrative order, on the mere suspicion of harboring radical views, and often for the sinister purpose of breaking labor strikes.

In the short span of three years our self-styled liberal Administration has succeeded in undermining the very foundation of political liberty and economic rights which this Republic has built up in more than a century of struggle and progress.

Under the hypocritical cloak of a false patriotism and under the protection of governmental terror the Democratic Administration has given the ruling classes unrestrained license to plunder the people by intensive exploitation of labor, by the extortion of enormous profits, and by increasing the cost of all necessities of life. Profiteering has become reckless and rampant, billions have been coined by the capitalists out of the suffering and misery of their fellow-men. The American financial oligarchy has become a dominant factor in the world, while the condition of the American workers grows more precarious.

The responsibility does not rest upon the Democratic Party alone. The Republican Party through its representatives in Congress and otherwise has not only openly condoned the political misdeeds of the last three years, but it has sought to outdo its Democratic rival in the orgy of political reaction and repression. Its criticism of the Democratic administrative policy is that it is not reactionary and drastic enough.

We particularly denounce the militaristic policy of both old parties of investing countless millions of dollars in armaments after the victorious completion of what was to have been the "last war"; we call attention to the fatal results of such a program in Europe, carried on prior to 1914, and culminating in the great war; we declare that such a policy, adding unbearable burdens to the working class and all the people, can lead only to the complete Prussianization of the nation, and we demand immediate and complete abandonment of the fatal program.

America is now at the parting of the roads. If the outraging of political liberty and concentration of economic power into the hands of the few is permitted to go on, it can have only one consequence, the reduction of the country to a state of absolute capitalist despotism.

The Socialist Party of the United States therefore summons all who believe in this fundamental doctrine to prepare for a complete reorganization of our social system, based upon public ownership of public necessities; upon government by representatives chosen from occupational as well as from geographical groups, in harmony with our industrial development; and with citizenship based on service; that we may end forever the exploitation of class by class.

The Socialist Party sounds the warning. It calls upon the people to defeat both old parties at the polls, and to elect the candidates of the Socialist Party to the end of restoring political democracy and bringing about complete industrial freedom.

To achieve this end the Socialist Party pledges itself to the following program:

Social

1. All business vitally essential for the existence and welfare of the people, such as railroads, express service, steamship lines, telegraphs, mines, oil wells, power plants, elevators, packing houses, cold storage plants and all industries operating on a national scale should be taken over by the nation.

2. All publicly owned industries should be administered jointly by the Government and representatives of the workers, not for revenue or profit, but with the sole object of securing just compensation and humane conditions of employment to the workers and efficient and reasonable service to the public.

3. All banks should be acquired by the Government and incorporated in a unified public banking system.

4. The business of insurance should be taken over by the Government and should be extended to include insurance against accident, sickness, invalidity, old age and unemployment, without contribution on the part of the worker.

5. Congress should enforce the provisions of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, with reference to the negroes, and that effective Federal legislation should be enacted to secure to the negroes full civil, political, industrial and educational rights.

Industrial

1. Congress should enact effective laws to abolish child labor, to fix minimum wages, based on an ascertained cost of a decent standard of life, to protect migratory and unemployed workers from oppression, to abolish detective and strike-breaking agencies and to establish a shorter workday in keeping with increased industrial productivity.

Political

1. The constitutional freedom of speech, press and assembly should be restored by repealing the espionage law and all other repressive legislation, and by prohibiting the executive usurpation of authority.

2. All prosecutions under the espionage law should be discontinued and all persons serving prison sentences for alleged offenses growing out of religious convictions, political views or industrial activities should be fully pardoned and immediately released.

3. No alien should be deported from the United States on account of his political views or participation in labor struggles, nor in any event without proper trial on specific charges. The arbitrary power to deport aliens by administrative order should be repealed.

4. The power of the courts to restrain workers in their struggles against employers by the writ of injunction or otherwise and their power to nullify Congressional legislation should be abrogated.

5. Federal Judges should be elected by the people and be subject to recall.

6. The President and the Vice-President of the United States should be elected by direct popular election and be subject to recall.

7. All members of the Cabinet should be elected by Congress and be responsible to Congress.

8. Suffrage should be equal and unrestricted, in fact as well as in law, for all men and women throughout the nation.

9. Adequate provision should be made for the registration of the votes of migratory workers.

10. The Constitution of the United States should be amended to strengthen the safeguards of civil and political liberty and to remove all obstacles to industrial and social reform and reconstruction, including the changes enumerated in this program, in keeping with the will and interest of the people. It should be made amendable by a majority of the voters of the nation upon their own initiative, or upon the initiative of Congress.

Foreign Relations

1. All claims of the United States against allied countries for loans made during the war should be canceled upon the understanding that all war debts, including indemnities, among such countries shall likewise be canceled. The largest possible credit in food, raw material and machinery should be extended to the stricken nations of Europe in order to help them rebuild the ruined world.

2. The Government of the United States should initiate a movement to dissolve the mischievous organization called the "League of Nations" and to create an international parliament, composed of democratically elected representatives of all nations of the world, based upon the recognition of their equal rights, the principles of self-determination, the right to national existence of colonies and other dependencies, freedom of international trade and trade routes by land and sea, and universal disarmament, and charged with revising the treaty of peace on the principles of justice and conciliation.

3. The United States should immediately make peace with the Central Powers and open commercial and diplomatic relations with Russia under the Soviet Government. It should promptly recognize the independence of the Irish Republic.

4. The United States should make and proclaim it a fixed principle in its foreign policy that American capitalists who acquire concessions or make investments in foreign countries do so at their own risk and under no circumstances should our Government enter into diplomatic negotiations or controversies or resort to armed conflicts on account of foreign property claims.

Fiscal

1. That all war debts and other debts of the Federal Government must be immediately paid off in full, the funds for such payment to be raised by means of a progressive property tax, whose burden should fall upon the rich and particularly upon great fortunes made during the war.

2. A standing progressive income and a graduated inheritance tax should be levied to provide for all needs of the Government, including the cost of its increasing social and industrial functions.

3. The unearned increment of land should be taxed, all land held out of use should be taxed at full rental value.

Minority Declaration[1]

1. The Socialist Party of the United States is the political expression of the interests of the workers in this country, and is part of the international working-class movement.

2. The economic basis of present day society is the private ownership and control of the socially necessary means of production and the exploitation of the workers who operate these means of production for the profit of those who own them.

3. The interests of these two classes are diametrically opposed. It is to the interest of the capitalist class to maintain the present system, and to obtain for themselves the largest possible share of the products of labor. It is to the interest of the working class to improve their conditions of life, and to get the largest possible share of their own product so long as the present system prevails, and to abolish the wage system as quickly as they can. This system, because of its inherent defects and weaknesses, is even now crumbling and breaking down in the greater part of the world.

4. In so far as the members of the opposing classes become conscious of these facts, each tries to advance its own interests as against the other. It is this active conflict of interests which we describe as the class struggle.

5. The capitalist class, by controlling the old political parties, controls the powers of the state, and uses them to secure and entrench its position. Without such control of the state, its position of economic power would be untenable. The workers must wrest the control of the government from the hands of the masters, and use its powers in the upbuilding of the new social order, the cooperative commonwealth.

6. The Socialist Party seeks to organize the working class for independent action on the political field, with the revolutionary aim of putting an end to exploitation and class rule. Such political action is absolutely necessary to the emancipation of the working class and the establishment of genuine freedom for all.

7. But to accomplish this aim, it is also necessary that the working class be powerfully and solidly organized on the economic field as well, to struggle for the same revolutionary goal; and the Socialist Party pledges its aid in the task of promoting such industrial organization and waging this industrial struggle.

8. In the final struggle of the workers for political supremacy, in order to facilitate the overthrow of the capitalist system, all power during the transitional period must be in the hands of the workers, in order to insure the success of the revolution.

9. To avoid unnecessary confusion, inefficiency and waste during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, the workers must begin now to train themselves in the problems incident to the control and management of industry.

10. The fundamental aim of the Socialist Party is to bring about social ownership and working class control of all the necessary means of production—to eliminate profit, rent and interest, and make it impossible for any to share in the product without sharing the burden of labor—to change our class society into a society controlled by all engaged in some form of useful work, through representative bodies chosen by occupational groups.

[1] Proposal of minority group rejected by Convention as basis for discussion by 103 votes to 33. To be submitted to the membership in referendum.

International Relations[1]

The international organization of Socialism has been disrupted as a result of the world war.

The old or Second International is represented principally by the majority party of Germany, the Socialist parties of the countries carved out from the former Austro-Hungarian empire, and of most of the countries of Europe that remained neutral during the war.

The parties affiliated with this organization have largely abandoned the revolutionary character and the militant methods of working class Socialism. As a rule they coöperate with the middle class reform parties of their countries.

[1] Report of Committee on International Relations. Carried by Convention, but to be submitted to referendum of the membership, along with the Minority Report, which runs as follows: "The Socialist Party of the United States of America reaffirms its affiliation with the Third International."

The Third or Moscow International was organized by the Communist Party of Russia with the coöperation of several other communist organizations recruited in the main from the countries split off from the former Russian empire and some Scandinavian and Balkan countries. The Third International also includes the Labor Party of Norway and the Communist Labor Party of Poland. Of the other important countries, the Socialist Parties of Switzerland, Italy and the United States, and the British Socialist Party have expressed their intention to affiliate with it.

The Moscow organization is virile and aggressive, inspired as it is by the militant idealism of the Russian revolution. It is, however, at this time only a nucleus of a Socialist International, and its progress is largely impeded by the attitude of its present governing committee, which seems inclined to impose upon all affiliated bodies the formula of the Russian revolution, "The dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of soviet power."

The Independent Socialist Party of Germany, the Socialist Party of France and the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain are unaffiliated. They have initiated a movement to unite all truly Socialist parties of the world, including those represented in the Moscow organization, into one International.

At no time was an active and effective organization of a Socialist International more vitally necessary for the success of Socialism than at this crucial period of the world's history. Socialism is in complete control in the great country of Russia. It is represented in the bourgeois governments of several important countries of Europe. The Socialists constitute the leading opposition parties in most of the remaining modern countries. It should be the task of the Socialist International to aid our comrades in Russia to maintain and fortify their political control and to improve and stabilize the economic and social conditions of their country, by forcing the great powers of Europe and America to abandon the dastardly policy of intrigue, war and starvation blockade against Soviet Russia. It should be its task to help the Socialists in countries of divided political control to institute full and true socialist governments, and to support the struggles of the Socialists in the capitalist-controlled countries, so that they may more speedily secure victory for the workers in their countries.

But above all a true Socialist International would at this time fulfill the all-important function of serving as the framework of the coming world parliament.

To accomplish these great tasks the International of Socialism must be truly socialist and truly International.

It cannot be truly Socialist if it is not based upon the program of complete socialization of the industries, and upon the principles of class struggle and uncompromising working class politics. It cannot be truly international unless it accords to its affiliated bodies full freedom in matters of policy and forms of struggle on the basis of such program and principles, so that the Socialists of each country may work out their problems in the light of their own peculiar economic, political and social conditions as well as the historic traditions.

In view of the above considerations the Socialist Party of the United States, while retaining its adherence to the Third International, instructs its Executive Committee, its International Secretary and International Delegates to be elected

(a) To insist that no formula such as "the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of soviets" or any other special formula for the attainment of the Socialist Commonwealth be imposed or exacted as condition of affiliation with the Third International.

(b) To participate in movements looking to the union of all true Socialist forces in the world into one International, and to initiate and further such movements whenever the opportunity is presented.

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Published Monthly by the

INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Room 914, Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Editor, HARRY W. LAIDLER. Wesleyan.
Managing Editor, W. HARRIS CROOK. Oxford.

Editorial Board

JAMES W. ALEXANDER.....Princeton
EVANS CLARK.....Amherst
H. W. L. DANA.....Harvard
LEWIS S. GANNETT.....Harvard
FELIX GRENDON.....Columbia
JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN.....Barnard
WINTHROP D. LANE.....Michigan
F. F. ROCKWELL.....Wesleyan
ALEXANDER TRACHTENBERG.....Trinity

Contributing Editors

Louis B. Boudin, Stuart Chase, Arthur Gleason, Freda Kirchwey, John Haynes Holmes, Florence Kelley, Bruno Lasker, Caro Lloyd, James H. Maurer, Wm. P. Montague, S. Nuorteva, James Oneal, Harry A. Overstreet, Vida D. Scudder, Charles P. Steinmetz, Norman M. Thomas, Louis Untermeyer, and Savel Zimand.

SUMMER

All summer addresses must reach the office by the 15th of the month in order to ensure correct delivery of the magazine.

The Rockford Trial

Edgar Owens

THE law of Illinois under the Criminal Syndicalist Act of 1919 provides that it is a felony to belong to an organization or society that advocates; or, by word of mouth, or in writing to advocate; or, to attend a meeting called for the purpose of advocating; or, to distribute printed matter which advocates; or, to display any flag, banner, sign, or symbol with the object of advocating—the reformation or overthrow of the existing representative form of government by force or violence or any other unlawful means. To do any of these things carries a penalty of from one to ten years imprisonment.

Another section of the Act provides that it is a misdemeanor to rent a room, hall, or building to any person or organization for the holding of meetings in which the overthrow of government is advocated by force or violence or other unlawful means. The penalty for violation of this section is a fine of $500. Legislatures run true to form. Property being sacred, landlords are not put in the same category as common persons who would disturb the tranquillity of the established order.

Scores of arrests were made in Rockford, Ill., last January, of Communists, Communist Laborites, and I. W. W. members. Their trials were set for January 26, Arthur Person being selected for the first test. On being arraigned, the indictment was quashed on the grounds of faulty construction. The same procedure held for the others indicted. They were immediately reindicted, whereupon the next few weeks contributed to the gaiety of nations and the squandering of the community's taxes while attorneys for state and defence hurled legal bombs at each other.

The Lineup

Clarence Darrow was chief counsel for the defence. Many a time have I heard him lecture. Soft of voice, kindly, bubbling with humor and quaint satire that makes you glad you are present. This was my first introduction to Clarence S. Darrow, lawyer. Never wasting himself on non-essentials, holding himself in reserve for the critical moment to come, then "zouie!" Four days had passed when the state attempted to introduce People's Exhibit No. 13, to wit: The Manifesto of the Third International, promulgated at Moscow in March, 1919. Then the kindly, quiet Darrow became the Angel of the Flaming Sword, stripping the issue bare. When the state's attorney came from under, hesitant, halting, illogical, and wholely incompetent, one felt almost inclined to pity him. Judge Welsh ruled that the Manifesto had no place in the evidence, as the state's attorney had failed to connect it up with Person.

Associated with Darrow were Frank H. Hall and John E. Goembel, Rockford attorneys. Frank Hall is an old-time socialist, member of the state executive committee of the Socialist Party of Illinois and always on the job when matters of this sort are up. John Goembel is not a socialist. But when most other Rockford attorneys were priding themselves on their Americanism, in some cases expressing themselves to the effect that they would kick anyone out of their offices should they be asked to take part in this sort of a defence, John Goembel stepped forward. He is one of Rockford's oldest attorneys, with a lucrative practice, and a decided sense of square dealing. A principle was at stake, and Goembel picked up his war club and went to battle.

The state was represented by State's Attorney William Johnson, S. L. Large, and G. B. Reno. Later on in the trial the state's attorney added one Marion Barnhart, special prosecutor in the Chicago Communist Labor Party trials.

Judge R. E. Welsh presided. Judge Welsh is "something new under the sun." I am told that before he was elected to the bench he was about the most able attorney in Rockford. In his rulings he was scrupulously fair, and in cases of this kind, fair rulings are always favorable to the defence. He made one feel that if all judges brought to their jobs the same sense of square dealing, capitalist courts would command more respect.

The Jury

Selection of the jury took three days. Rockford has a preponderant Swedish population whose religion is mostly Lutheran. There are also plenty of Irish. You are right about their religion.

In addition to the regulation panel of thirty-six, an extra fifty had been summoned for service. By mutual consent farmers were excused. Farmers are getting to be a favored class, for potatoes are selling for $1.45 a peck!

It was necessary to call three special venires of fifteen each before the jury was finally selected. There were seven Swedes, three Irishmen, a Scotchman, and one whose nationality I do not know.

Mr. Darrow is a real artist in the selection of a jury. Always kindly, humorous, and gentle, he immediately put the prospective juror at his ease and as a consequence invariably got candid replies to his questions. On the other hand, the state's

attorney's voice was a strident squawk, very disconcerting to the inexperienced juror.

Some of the sallies were amusing. A real estate dealer was being examined:

Mr. Darrow: "Did you ever read anything on socialism or communism?"

Prospective Juror: "I waded through Karl Marx once."

Mr. D.: "Did you ever hear anyone speak on socialism?"

P. J.: "Yes, I attended one of your lectures."

Mr. D.: "How did you like it?"

P. J.: "I stayed to the end."

Mr. D.: "Ever hear me on any other occasion?"

P. J.: "I was going to attend your debate on "Is Life Worth Living " and you said it wasn't, so I thought, 'What's the use?' "

Mr. Johnson was examining a juror:

Mr. Johnson: "You are in favor of the existing representative form of our government, are you not?"

Prospective Juror: "Well, not all of it."

Mr. J.: "And what part are you opposed to?"

P. J.: "The eighteenth amendment."

This gentleman was a former saloon-keeper.

The Trial Begins

Thursday morning, the fourth day of the trial, the state began the introduction of testimony. Dr. O. Alfred Olson was the first witness called. Dr. Olson was among the first to be arrested in the "red raids" last January. He had taken an active part in the organization of the Rockford branch of the Communist Labor Party. Olson was a delegate to the Socialist convention in Chicago last summer, withdrew from the Socialist Party at that time, and took part in the formation of the Communist Labor Party. He was strong for a revolutionary party, until the guardians of "law 'n order" swooped down upon him. Then Dr. Olson pleaded guilty to the charges set forth in the indictment and turned state's evidence. However, his testimony was not at all damaging. He told of his participation in the convention in Chicago; of his part in the organization of the Rockford branch of the C. L. P.; of serving as temporary officer; of arranging for speakers and organizers; in short, he testified that he was the moving spirit in the Rockford organization. He identified the certificate of affiliation; the minute book and the financial secretary's book, application blanks and membership cards, dues stamps and the Local's charter. And he testified to Arthur Person's participation in the affairs of the organization. The irony of the whole situation rests in the fact that the jury brought in a verdict of "not guilty." But I anticipate.

Everything Is Red

Then the state's attorney began introducing People's Exhibits. There were No. 1, and No. 2, and No. 3, and so on till I lost count, when he sprung "People's Exhibit No. 13." In the meantime, though, he had read into the record the platform and program of the Communist Labor Party. The court room was packed and a lot of people heard it read—people who had never heard it before. And the newspapers commented on it. In fact, that platform and program were given considerable publicity.

But People's Exhibit No. 13 commanded most attention. The state's attorney referred to this exhibit as "The Red Bible." He had expert witnesses present to give testimony on this exhibit. It was the Manifesto of the Third International. Special Agent George Commerow said he saw it consulted at the national convention. But he was not sure who did the consulting and he "couldn't swear that it was a correct translation of the original document given to the world at Moscow in March, 1919." However, he testified that department of justice agents were delegates to the C. L. P. convention. He called them his confidential informants. Mr. Darrow demanded the names of his confidential informants, but he refused to answer on the grounds that it would expose the personnel of Mr. Palmer's Black Hundreds, and the judge sustained him. C. A. Sloan of the editorial staff of the *Chicago Tribune* told what he knew of the Manifesto at the convention. But he wasn't sure of anything, other than that Arthur Proctor runs The Clarion, a radical bookshop at 204 North Clark Street, Chicago. Lots of Rockford people know now where they can get radical books.

Now Comes the Professor

It was at this time that the state introduced its "expert." This was a certain professor of political economy in an Illinois college. The professor admitted himself that what he didn't know about socialism and communism hadn't been discovered. And he was perfectly willing to talk about it, but Mr. Darrow kept butting in all the time. He had a whole lapful of books and papers. Some of them were published in England and some of them were published in this country. He had a number of copies of the *Revolutionary Age,* the *Communist,* and the *Communist Labor News.* He was going to prove that the Ida Ferguson translation of the Manifesto was the true translation of the Manifesto. He was going to prove it, only Mr. Darrow wouldn't let him say hardly anything.

It was during this part of the proceedings that Mr. Darrow pulled his lightning change. The kindly, easygoing manner sloughed off. The jury was excused to its jury room, and then the fight began. Able, alert, confident, he tore loose. Of course, he said, the Communist Labor Party declares itself in complete accord with the principles of communism as laid down in the Manifesto of the Third International formed at Moscow. It so states in its platform and program. But at the same time it defines those principles, interprets them, and sets forth its interpretation in its program, and as this program had already been introduced into the record, that was sufficient. No state's attorney should be allowed to present an arbitrary interpretation of those principles and upon his arbitrary interpretation endeavor to obtain a conviction. The state's attorney tried to reply to Darrow's masterful argument, but Judge Welsh ruled that Mr. Johnson had failed to connect up and that the Manifesto could not be introduced in the evidence.

And the Professor? He stuck around. There were some terrible words in that platform and program. The word "revolution" and its derivatives appear a number of times. There is "conquest of the capitalist state," and "capture of political power," and "mass action," and that terrible "dictatorship of the proletariat." And the Professor was going to stick around and tell what those words and phrases meant.

But he didn't. Harry Laidler, organizing secretary of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, author of a number of books, and editor of the *Socialist Review,* happened to be in Rockford the second day of the trial. He delivered a lecture on "Guild Socialism." Arrangements were made whereby the defence could keep in touch with Laidler in the event that he was needed. And when the defence divined the purpose of Mr. Johnson and his Professor, Laidler was sent for. He arrived Friday noon. And when the state discovered this they seem to have decided that the witness stand was no place for the Professor.

The State Rests

At this point the state sprung a surprise. The defence had been served with notice that some thirty-two witnesses were to be called. There were to be experts on Bolshevism and the Russian revolution. Egan and McDonnough of the anarchist squad of the Chicago police department were to do their bit. Every angle of a case of this sort was to be treated. But after introducing the testimony of eight witnesses, four of whom were of the federal and state police department, another a stenographer of the state's attorney's office, the state rested. This was Thursday afternoon. Three days to select a jury, and one day for the state to present its case. It began to appear that Mr. Johnson was a bluffer.

Person Takes Stand

Friday morning Person took the stand in his own behalf. He told his life's history, which is the history of most every working man. Born in Sweden, forty years ago, he managed to get a few years of common schooling when he had to go to work. He came to America and direct to Rockford when he was eighteen years old; worked a while in a knitting mill, then in a glass factory beveling mirrors, work he has been doing ever since. He became an American citizen as soon as he was eligible. In due time he married and now has a family of a wife and three children. His wife, Christine, is also under indictment charged with the same offence. He refused to entertain the idea of violence in relation to the Communist Labor Party, maintaining that its program and platform could be put in effect without any resort to force. And a three-hour grilling by the state's attorney failed to move him from that position. A group of character witnesses testified to his standing in the community. The defence put on no other witnesses.

The Arguments

Assistant State's Attorney Large opened for the prosecution. He was seeing red. Red membership card, red dues stamps. A red minute book. A charter with the sun's rays in red. Platform and program printed on red paper. Among the People's Exhibits was the certificate of affiliation with the C. L. P., containing the names of temporary officers, number of charter members, and a statement of financial resources. Thirty cents was recorded as the financial strength of Rockford Branch. And with this stupendous amount of wealth the Communist Labor Party of Rockford was going to overthrow the existing representative form of government. Judge, jury, attorneys, and audience roared and the bailiff rapped for order. Mr. Large did the best he could with a hopeless case and appeared to be glad when his time was up.

Mr. Goembel opened for the defence and riddled the state's case, pointing out that not a scrap of evidence had been introduced even indicating that force and violence had been advocated either by Person, or in the platform and program. Court thereupon adjourned till Saturday morning.

Darrow in Action

Darrow's heart was in his work and he made a most effective job of it. Judge Welsh announced on opening court that any demonstration would

result in a halt in the proceedings while the court room was cleared. Accordingly intense quiet prevailed all through the address. The court room was packed with a crowd that was held spellbound by the matchless oratory of the man. And no opportunity to relieve the tension by laugh or applause. For two hours and a half he piled fact upon fact until he had built up a defence that was not to be seriously assaulted by anything the prosecution might have to offer. His treatment of special agents was a joy to hear, special agents who had turned the country into a madhouse with their interference with the rights of the people. "Sneaking sleuths, feeding at the public crib." In closing he said that a verdict of "guilty" would be no disgrace to Person, but that the court house and the city hall should be draped in crêpe while the jury did penance in sack cloth and ashes while Person was in prison.

Johnson Closes

When Mr. Johnson presented the final argument to the jury he was facing a situation that was enough to make a much more able man hesitate. But his unbounded egotism carried him through. He attempted a defence of his sleuths, enlarging upon their gentle, humane methods, that they were performing their sworn duty, and his pride in having them associated with him in the wonderful work of preserving 100 per cent Americanism. When he got through with the eagle there wasn't even a pin feather left.

Being a layman, there was much in Judge Welsh's instructions to the jury that I could not follow. They were in line with the eminently fair methods the Court had employed during the entire proceedings. The jury retired at four o'clock, reached a verdict, and made their report shortly before ten Saturday evening. The verdict was "Not Guilty."

So ended the first case to be tried in Illinois under the State Criminal Syndicalist Act.

The unreasoning hysteria engendered by the world war, and cultivated and fostered by Security leagues and Defence councils, is slowly but surely passing away, and the time is not far distant when state's attorneys and their special agents will have to find some other method of "keeping in the eye of the people" than rounding up, persecuting, and prosecuting men and women whose only offence is their labor in behalf of their kind.

SPECIAL OFFER

Vol. 8 (Dec., 1919-May, 1920) of *The Socialist Review* for one dollar in the U. S. A. Send money order today. 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

College Notes

Harry Laidler's three weeks' trip through the Middle West in April, and his briefer visit to the New England States in May, bring to a close a successful year of I. S. S. activity in the colleges.

On Sunday, April 4, Mr. Laidler made his first stop at Pittsburgh. Here he debated on "The Economic Interpretation of History" with Professor James of the University of Pittsburgh, under the auspices of the local alumni chapter of the I. S. S., known as "The Collegiate Social Science Club." The next day Mr. Laidler's topic was "The Present Status of the Socialist Party in the United States: Is it Becoming Red?" before about two hundred business men, social workers, etc., of the Hungry Club. On Tuesday he addressed three classes of some 400 students at the University of Pittsburgh on various aspects of Socialism and the Cooperative movement, and in the evening he spoke before the Economics Club. Mr. Laidler felt that there was a growing liberalism among the faculty and students of this university. The town itself is so reactionary, however, that there are only about fifty-seven subscribers to the *New Republic,* and the press considers the Committee of Forty-eight too radical to mention.

At Ohio Wesleyan, Mr. Laidler spoke before two classes and a Social Science Club. There has been a great deal of military training at Ohio State and here Mr. Laidler found less tolerance. He addressed a class on "Boycotts and the Labor Struggle," and a public meeting arranged by the I. S. S. chapter, of which Sonya Forthal is the leading spirit.

Some 600 people heard Mr. Laidler the following Sunday afternoon, at Herbert Bigelow's church in Cincinnati.

In St. Louis Mr. Laidler found war hysteria and anti-Bolshevik feeling rampant. The City Club, which for the two years preceding has arranged meetings for Mr. Laidler, has this year made Langdon-Davies one of the few exceptions to a uniformly conservative program. Through personal interviews, however, the Secretary succeeded in forming a nucleus for a strong alumni chapter in the city and an undergraduate chapter at Washington University.

On Friday, April 16, the Secretary visited the University of Illinois, and spoke before the combined classes of Professor Watkins on "Socialism as a Political Movement." A dinner was held for Mr. Laidler in the evening, at which he talked informally on the value of forums, and interested a number of students in forming an I. S. S. chapter.

A new chapter was organized by Mr. Laidler at the University of Chicago, with Ernest Tratt-

ner of the Theological Seminary as secretary.

Mr. Laidler spoke before the Constitutional Rights League at Rockford, Illinois, on "Guild Socialism." He later returned to Rockford to act as expert witness at the trial of the communists, at the request of Attorneys Darrow and Hall.

The most successful meeting of the trip was at the University of Wisconsin, where the chapter now numbers 125 members. The meeting was well advertised with posters and dodgers distributed at the factories, and between five and six hundred students and members of the faculty attended. The next day the students organized a hike for the afternoon, gave a dinner to the secretary, arranged a meeting before the Madison Central Labor Council, and wound up with a reception.

The University of Michigan chapter is handicapped by the spirit of intolerance in the college, and by a group of students organized in a Marine Corps, who pass resolutions against radicalism, and attempt to interfere with radical meetings. Nevertheless, the I. S. S. group has been able to secure a number of fine speakers this year, and arranged a good meeting for Mr. Laidler followed by interesting discussion, in spite of the fact that the date had been changed at the last minute.

Sunday evening at Cleveland, a small group met with the secretary for dinner. The next morning he addressed Professor Lutz's economics class at Oberlin. Out of a class of seventy, only one student had heard of the Albany ouster! A small Liberal Club exists at Oberlin, which has not been able to do very effective work, and which will consider affiliating with the I. S. S.

In Buffalo, Mr. Laidler found several people who will probably organize an alumni chapter in the fall.

The last stop of the secretary was at Rochester, where Mrs. Gannett and Meyer Jacobstein arranged a meeting consisting of representatives from the University of Rochester, the Divinity School, and a number of ministers, labor managers, etc.

The results reported by Mr. Laidler indicate that a considerable amount of war hysteria still exists, and that it will take some time for things to settle down to normal. The secretary found, however, that everywhere much interest is shown in the latest phases of Socialism and the Labor Movement, and that whereas at the present time some of the liberals and radicals feel it would be unwise to start groups, conditions will be ripe for many healthy organizations in the fall.

* * *

Shortly after his return from the Middle West, Mr. Laidler made a brief trip to New England. He spoke before two classes at Wellesley, before Professor Hankins' class and the Liberal Club at Clark University, and addressed a meeting of the newly organized I. S. S. chapter at Boston University.

* * *

The Brooklyn Polytechnic Liberal Club is going forward vigorously despite indifference on the part of the many students whose aim is a purely technical education. This group held a very successful meeting recently for Norman Hapgood.

The University of California chapter has wound up its work for the year, and plans an active organization in the fall. David Greenberg has been elected secretary.

The Social Problems Club of C. C. N. Y. has concluded a fine year's work with an imposing array of speakers. Fiorello La Guardia addressed the group in March on the rent problem, at a meeting presided over by President Mezes. The day following Judge Jacob Panken spoke on "The High Cost of Living and Profits." In April Don Seitz of *The World* discussed "Things in General," and Oswald Garrison Villard spoke on "The Press and the Present Crisis" at the largest and most successful meeting of the year. Over 600 were present, and some 300 had to be turned away.

Professor Giddings and John Haynes Holmes were the May speakers.

The culmination of the year's activities was the Soiree held by the club at the Yorkville Casino on May 15. The subject of the evening was "Democracy in Education," and the speakers were Floyd Dell, Frank Harris, Leo Linder, Judah Magnes, Scott Nearing, and Bird Stair. Harry Laidler presided, and Mrs. Laidler sang. Dancing followed the speaking.

Sidney E. Borgeson has written from the University of Minneapolis that a group of about twenty-five radical students would like to form a chapter of the I. S. S.

The New York Alumni Chapter has held its final Camaraderie for the season. Recent speakers have been Lola Ridge, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Ellen Hayes, Joseph Jablonower, Bishop Paul Jones, and George H. Goebel. A rollicking evening was afforded the chapter by Red Doran, who conducted a "Dutch Auction," the proceeds of which went to the Centralia Defense Fund. The chapter also arranged a benefit for *The Socialist Review,* with an imposing array of talent. Edith Wynne Matthison and Charles Rann Kennedy read from "The Servant in the House," Siegfried Sassoon and Floyd Dell gave selections from their works, and Art Young talked informally on "What Is Funny."

Sovereignty vs. Public Service

Law and the Modern State. Leon Duguit. Translated by Frieda and Harold Laski. N. Y.: Huebsch. 1919.

Professor Duguit's introductory chapter closes with the following significant words, which not only summarize his book, but characterize a revolution in ideas that is taking place under our noses. "The idea of public service," he declares, "replaces the idea of sovereignty. The state is no longer a sovereign power in issuing commands. It is a group of individuals who must use the force they possess to supply the public need. The idea of public service lies at the very base of the theory of the modern state."

The demonstration as to how this has come about occupies the body of the book. Through illustrations drawn primarily from French legal history, Duguit shows the growth away from state absolutism and from the idea of governments as sacrosanct bodies. He considers how in general statutes relating to the powers of voluntary groups and local communities, in special statutes delegating large power to administrative bodies like the state railways, in the newly recognized personal liability of public servants for the consequences of their acts, the community has progressively registered itself in favor of practical denials of the idea of unitary sovereignty. It has been groping toward the idea that the state organization justifies itself in proportion as it is serviceable to the community.

Statutes are thus no longer to be conceived as "the commands of the sovereign state"; they are "the organic rule of a service or a body of men." Similarly an administrative act becomes not primarily a display of official authority or even an official act in obedience to public command; "it is always an act made in view of the rule of service."

Mr. Laski, whose introduction is of inestimable value in suggesting the relation of the book's thesis to American problems, puts the case admirably in saying that "the only justification for a public act is that its result in public good should be commensurate with the force that is involved in its exercise."

The translator's introduction does more, however, than state Professor Duguit's position in terms which have a familiar ring to American ears. He helpfully suggests those sources in English and American literature which outline the problem of authority in relation to our own conditions. And the reader who is not prompted by the really startling implication of Duguit's theories, to think them through into application to the American legal and economic systems, will have failed to get the major value from his reading. For this volume comprises really an introduction to the problem of the practical consequences of various ideas about the nature and purpose of the state.

ORDWAY TEAD.

The Labor Year Book

The American Labor Year Book—1919-1920. Edited by Alexander Trachtenberg, Director, Department of Labor Research, Rand School of Social Science. Volume III.

There may be a difference of opinion as to the purpose which a labor handbook should serve. Those who want a convenient compendium of events and documents, a sort of handy reference book, will find the American Labor Year Book for 1919-1920 extremely useful. It is comprehensive. It covers many phases of the American labor and socialist movement during 1919-1920. It contains much valuable information on labor conditions in Europe. It has a number of articles of a more general nature, such as the article on Standards of Living by Wm. F. Ogburn, which brings the subject up to date. The articles are written by competent persons who are in close touch with the problems they treat.

But there is what the French call "l'embarras des richesses." Abundance may be depressing. One wants guidance to find oneself in the maze of things. Evidently, the editor of the Year Book had this in mind when he arranged his volume into six distinct parts, according to general topics. It is also clear that the editor was guided by his socialist point of view in correlating the minor sections in each division. But on the whole one wonders whether a year book could not be given greater unity than the one under consideration. Could not events be related into more general tendencies, and tendencies again be surveyed as currents in the general social movement? I am not sure it can be done without detriment to detail and completeness. I do not know of any year book in which it has been done. I merely suggest it as a possibility. Perhaps the book could be made more effective in that way.

Personally, I have found the American Labor Year Book very useful as it is. The editor should be especially commended for his broad and tolerant attitude towards all phases of the social problem and for his good judgment in collecting within the covers of one volume so many significant documents and statistical tables. The volume is indispensable to teachers, writers, lecturers, and every one else who has an intelligent interest in the facts and problems of the labor movement.

LOUIS LEVINE.